

F

685

G75

Granite State Club. Washington, D.C.

1856.

Conspiracy disclosed.

Kansas affairs.





Class F685

Book G75

975
Granite State Club, Washington, D.C.
16

CONSPIRACY DISCLOSED!!

KANSAS AFFAIRS.

READ! READ!! READ!!!

READ the following proof from the speech of Mr. Letcher, of the 2d of August, 1856, in the House of Representatives, that a conspiracy was entered into "immediately after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act" by the Black Republican members of Congress, to drive out pro-slavery settlers from Kansas, which has resulted in the recent scenes of violence and bloodshed there. Let it be borne in mind that this proof is extracted from the testimony of one of the conspirators themselves, (Mr. Mace, of Indiana.) It is proven, too, by the proceedings of the Emigrant Aid Societies' Convention, held at Buffalo, 10th and 11th of July last, an account of which may be found in an article from the New York Journal of Commerce, on page 3, and in several other articles which follow it, all tending to prove this and other base purposes of the conspirators.

The proceedings referred to show very clearly that those misguided men actually *contemplated civil war* in Kansas. Otherwise what did they want with "A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS A MONTH," which one of their resolutions calls for? Gerrit Smith, who took part in the proceedings, was frank enough to express in words what the resolution left to be understood, and, therefore, subscribed "*fifteen hundred dollars a month, DURING THE WAR.*" More recent developments explain the mystery of these words. General Lane's army was soon after collected at Chicago, and marched into Kansas, through Iowa and Nebraska Territory. And scarcely had they reached their destination, than we find them, and others, attacking and capturing the village of Franklin, breaking up a pro-slavery settlement on Washington creek, dispersing a colony of

Georgians on the Ossawatimie, attacking and capturing Colonel Titus's house, near Leecompton, and doing various other things in violation of the Constitution. In short, they went to work as if determined to provoke somebody to fight them, and they have, at length, succeeded. One of their "reverend" aiders and abettors, Rev. Mr. Nute, of Lawrence, Kansas, says, in a letter to the Springfield (Massachusetts) Republican, dated August 22, 1856:

"We are having war in earnest—four fights within the last five days, in all of which the free-State men were the assailants and the victors."

If it be asked—What was the object of getting up a war in Kansas—it is answered, to *help elect Fremont*. For, the greater the disturbance in Kansas, the more clear would be the apparent "villainy" of repealing the Missouri compromise. This seems to have been the theory of the Black Republicans from the first; and, therefore, they early began to show the cloven foot. Here is what Mr. Letcher says:

When the Kansas territorial bill was under consideration here, the editorial leader of the present revolutionary party who wields the power in this House—none other than Mr. Greeley, of the New York Tribune—proclaimed that he would rather see this Capitol "blaze by the torch of the incendiary," than that the Kansas bill should become a law.

The following is an extract from one of his many incendiary articles on this subject:

"We urge, therefore, unbending determination on the part of the northern members hostile to this intolerable outrage, and demand of them, in behalf of peace, in behalf of freedom, in behalf of justice and humanity, resistance to the last. Better that confusion should ensue—better that discord should reign in the national councils—better that Congress should break up in wild disorder—may, better that the Capitol itself should blaze by the torch of the incendiary, or fall and bury all its inmates beneath its crumbling ruins,

he could spare for such things, and felt that he was now called upon to contribute means to arm men and send them out to fight. He continued to urge at length the necessity for bold action. He quoted from speeches of Mr. Atchison, and Mr. Rives of Virginia, to prove that the South had declared they would never give up Kansas until they were forced to give up slavery. He had also better authority for this, and one which none in this convention would dispute. He had a letter from their own candidate for the Presidency, Colonel Frémont, who declared the same thing. Mr. Smith continued to speak of the aggressions of the South, and said *he only hoped to hear of a collision at Topeka; that he only desired to hear of a collision with the Federal troops, and that northern men had fallen, and then he would hear of northern States arraying themselves against the Federal Government; and would that be the end? No! Missouri would be the next battle-field, and then slavery would be driven to the wall. Her strength is only apparent; it consists half in northern cowards and doughfaces. It has been brave and rampant only because the North has fled before it. It will run when the North faces it. He believed the time had come to use physical force.* If the convention thought, with Governor Reeder, that such was not the fact, with all respect, he could have no sympathy with it.

Governor Reeder replied that he was not in favor of waiting because they had not received wrongs enough, but thought it right to wait until they could strike an effective blow. If it remained with him to use the power of the Government, he would not have waited thus long, but the oppressors, before this, *would have been converted into heaps of dead men on the fields of Missouri;* but he was willing to wait till to-morrow, or two to-morrows. When on the trail of the enemy, against whom he had a deadly hate, he would follow him with cat-like tread, and would not strike until he could strike him dead. He was, therefore, willing to wait until they had the power he would thus have used. He did not wish to give the South notice of their intentions by marching armed men into the Territory. *The dragoons could go in as voters, or to cultivate the soil, and strike when the right time arrived.* When the right time came to strike, he wanted the South to have the first notice of the blow in the blow itself. The free-State party take the ground that they will exhaust all peaceful remedies; and that done, they will resist to the death, and pile the soil the Constitution no longer protects with heaps of their oppressors.

Gerrit Smith thought if this chain of reasoning were correct, then the convention should sit with closed doors and not pass resolutions to raise *one hundred thousand dollars a month.* The South would be silly if they did not know this money was to be raised for the purpose of doing something with it.

Near the close of the proceedings a collection was taken up.

Gerrit Smith contributed FIFTEEN HUNDRED DOLLARS A MONTH DURING THE WAR—filling up a check on the State bank of Albany for the first installment.

Mr. Whitman, of Kansas Territory, moved that a fund of \$25,000 be raised, to be loaned in sums not exceeding \$200 to settlers in Kansas, to enable them to secure their preemption claims at once.

Governor Reeder entirely approved of the suggestion for loaning money to settlers to enable them to pay for land, but thought that it would answer the purpose to recommend the subject to the notice of capitalists in various cities, who would find such investments profitable ones. He moved an amendment to that effect, which was carried.

Governor Reeder read to the convention the report from Kansas of the dispersion of the Territorial Legislature by Colonel Sumner, and remarked, at the close, that he was sorry that the Legislature had not waited till driven out at the point of the bayonet. [Cheers.]

Mr. L. R. Noble asked how many troops there were, belonging to the United States, in Kansas?

Governor Reeder said, about six hundred.

Mr. Noble. And how many in the entire Army of the United States?

Governor Reeder. I believe fifteen thousand.

Mr. Noble. I learn from a friend near me that they can't send more than ten thousand men into Kansas; and so, I say, let us go on.

Gerrit Smith desired to see the contributions continued.

A delegate said he would give one hundred men who did not fear the devil; and, like Cromwell, would praise God, and keep their powder dry.

Gerrit Smith thought funds were wanted first, and hoped to see the collections go on.

No other subscriptions, however, were received.

[From the Washington Union.]

The Base Conspiracy Confessed.

We give below a most remarkable exposition of the insidious designs of the Black Republicans, taken from the Detroit Free Press. It confirms, beyond all question, the charge which again and again we have made, that the hue and cry about Kansas was a miserable electioneering hypocrisy, invented and kept alive by a set of dishonest demagogues, who seek, by sectional agitation and excitement, so to inflame and poison the public mind as to secure the election of their automaton candidate, John C. Frémont. This exposure deserves to be published in every honest journal in the land, as it should be read by every honest-minded voter, for it gives the only true explanation of the thousand and one *raw-head-and-bloody-bones* outrages which have been hawked over the length and breadth of the land. It contains evidence which should convince every honest man of the desperate recklessness of the Black Republican party, of its utter want of every principle of honesty, patriotism, or truth; that they are not only willing, but actually have, with deliberation and premeditation, instigated, paid, and equipped a set of lawless marauders to invade the Territory of Kansas with fire and sword; to burn, pillage, and murder, if need be, and all for the mere purpose of raising a disturbance sufficient to procure the election of John C. Frémont.

On Saturday we published the following telegraphic dispatch, dated St. Louis, September 5:

"Private advices from Kansas state that, on Tuesday last, every free-State man was driven from Leavenworth at the point of the bayonet, and all their property destroyed or confiscated. Mr. Phillips, the correspondent of the New York Tribune, and his brother, were killed. The house of the former, and the store of the latter, were burned. It is

said Mr. Phillips fired from his house and killed two pro-slavery men. Forty sufferers arrived here to-day entirely destitute. Fuller particulars to-morrow."

The same dispatch appeared in the New York Tribune of Saturday, which paper of that day says in its editorial columns:

"Our correspondent at St. Louis appears to be under the impression that the Mr. Phillips who, with his brother, has been shot, is the special Kansas correspondent of the Tribune, whose death has long been an avowed object among the Missouri ruffians. This, however, is a mistake. Our Mr. Phillips recently left the Territory for a brief visit to the States, and on the day of the battle he was in this city. He is now returning, and will soon be at his post again in Kansas."

He was in this city on Friday, and came into our office, mistaking it for one of the Black Republican newspaper offices. He introduced himself as the Kansas correspondent of the New York Tribune, on his return to the Territory. Without dispelling his illusion, we asked him "if it was probable such a row could be got up in Kansas as would subvert the Republican cause, and aid the election of Frémont?" He said, "Yes, that is the intention, and I think we shall succeed; our plans are well laid, and can scarcely fail. We are determined that the war shall last until November, of whatever cost. I shall be in Kansas in ten days, and I have instructions in my pocket for Colonel Lane." We asked him some other questions, which he answered with singular frankness, disclosing a conspiracy of the Black Republican leaders regarding Kansas more heinous and villainous, we verily believe, than any conspiracy ever before hatched. When we informed him that he had entered the wrong pew—that he was in the office of a Democratic, and not of a Black Republican paper—that he had been addressing a Buchanan, and not a Frémont man—he was struck dumb with amazement, from which he did not instantly recover. When he did recover, he muttered something inaudibly, and incontinently fled.

The information thus obtained assures us positively of things we have not at any time doubted. It assures us that there have been but few difficulties in Kansas that were not the result of plans deliberately laid by Black Republican confederates, and deliberately executed by the agents of these confederates; and it assures us that provision has been made of men and money by which Kansas will, if it be possible, be kept in the most terrible state of turmoil during this month and the next, for the sole purpose of exasperating the northern mind and affecting the presidential election.

We have no language to express abhorrence of the plot revealed. Is it not abominable, atrocious, hellish? Could pirates be guilty of anything worse? Could devils concoct a more damnable scheme? Civil war is instigated, innocent blood is shed—all in pursuance of caucus arrangement—to influence the pending political contest! and such creatures as this Phillips are employed by the New York Tribune to chronicle the deeds of death actually committed, and to manufacture "outrages" having no foundation in point of fact! When will the people see this Kansas business in its true light?

[From the Union.]

A Challenge Accepted.

"A more truly patriotic body of men never assembled in this country than the convention which nominated John C.

Frémont and William L. Dayton; and when the Union declares that some of its prominent actors were men who had been boldest in avowing disunion sentiments, it makes a most unwarrantable and reckless statement. We challenge the Union to designate a prominent actor in that convention, or even one member of it, however humble, who has avowed disunion sentiments. It cannot do it. The charge, is utterly false."—General James Watson Webb.

We pass over the assertion that the Philadelphia convention was a "patriotic body of men" as one of those patent falsehoods which need no answer. General Webb was a prominent actor in that convention, and would hardly fail to trumpet his own patriotism. But the gallant patriot challenges us to designate one member of the convention who has avowed disunion sentiments. As Nathan said unto David, so say we unto General Webb—*Thou art the man!* Read what you said in the Philadelphia convention, General Webb, amidst the loud cheers of the delegates:

"They ask us to give them a nomination which, when put fairly before the people, will unite public sentiment, and, through the ballot-box, will restrain and repel this pro-slavery extension, and this aggression of the slaveocracy. What else are they doing? They tell you that they are willing to abide by the ballot-box, and willing to make that the last appeal. *If we fail there, what then? We will drive it back, sword in hand, and so help me God! believing that to be right, I am with them.* [Loud cheers, and cries of "Good!"]"

A Traitor to His God and Country.

The New York Tribune highly eulogizes the eloquence and patriotism of Mr. Burlingame. Will the Tribune publish the following extract from a speech recently delivered by its favorite?

"THE TIMES DEMAND AND WE MUST HAVE AN ANTI-SLAVERY CONSTITUTION, AN ANTI-SLAVERY BIBLE, AND AN ANTI-SLAVERY GOD."

[From the Union.]

The Voice of the People on Treason in Congress and Treason in Kansas.

The veteran patriot, General Cass, declared, in his place in the Senate, that he "regarded this as the most solemn crisis that had ever occurred in the history of this country; and he hoped the people would awake to a sense of the dangers to which they were exposed from the spirit of sectionalism that now controls the other House of Congress before it should be too late."

At once the people are awakened to a sense of the dangers which threaten. Already are they beginning to vent their indignation upon the authors of these perils. From every quarter of the land the presses are teeming with denunciations of the legislative treason. With one accord, and almost without exception, the papers throughout the country recognize a concert of action, cordial coöperation, between the Black Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Black Republicans in Kansas. They have a common aim, and work to a common end.

Under the head of "THE REPUBLICAN NEROS," the Providence Post says:

"It is said that Nero fiddled while Rome was burning. The Republican Neros at Washington have already outdone the Nero of old. They not only laugh when revolution and anarchy are threatened, but they invite them to come. *They court their presence as co-laborers for Frémont!* They refuse to vote a dollar to the Army of the United States, now more than ever needed on the frontiers, unless the appropriation can be coupled with a virtual repeal of the criminal laws in Kansas. They thus plainly say to the country, that unless they can open Kansas to every species of outlawry, and expose its peaceable citizens to the rav-

ages of the plundering gangs who have gone, and are going, there from the North and the South—unless the incendiary's torch can light up their villages, and the murderer's rifle can proclaim its work to the inhabitants of the prairies—unless cut-throats can stalk unmolested, and inoffensive women and children can welter in their own innocent blood—unless, in short, the devilish appetite for outrage which they have themselves created can be gratified to the very full, and civil war, with its ten thousand horrors, can be spread over the country—one arm, at least, of the national defense shall be stricken down!"

After giving an account of the Kansas wing of the party of disunionists, the same paper says:

"Take the facts here narrated in connection with the action of the House of Representatives, and is it not plain that the purpose of the Republicans is to INVOLVE THE WHOLE COUNTRY IN CIVIL WAR, AFTER TYING THE HANDS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?"

The Dayton Empire says:

THE BLOODY WORK OF ABOLITIONISM AND DISUNIONISM COMMENCED.—From the telegraphic dispatches in our paper to-day, our readers will learn that the work of murder and outrage, of civil war and treason, has been commenced by Lane and his Abolition mercenaries and hirelings in Kansas. They are making war against the United States, rescuing prisoners from the hands of the United States authorities, burning the dwellings of peaceable citizens, and butchering those who lift a voice or a finger to stay them in their reasonable, incendiary, and bloody work.

"But the stain of outrage, and the blood of murdered citizens, does not rest alone upon the villain Lane and the wretches he commands; it is upon the men who, by their money, have collected and sent his force into Kansas, and upon the men who, by their sympathies and advice, have sustained his treason and rebellion."

Speaking of the Kansas news, the Springfield Argus says:

"And from the generality and extent of the organization of the Black Republican forces, it seems clear that they have been organized on the assurance of their friends in Congress that the Army bill should be defeated, and that the signal for them to begin hostilities was the adjournment of Congress, after having tied the hands of the Executive so as to render him powerless to suppress insurrection and prevent bloodshed. It is, therefore, clear as day that the Republicans meant to inaugurate civil war, and that the attack on the opposite party was concerted at Washington, by the Black Republican majority in Congress. The defeat of the Army bill was necessary to the success of their plans of insurrection. The Black Republican House did its part by defeating the bill, and immediately its partisans in Kansas lighted the flame of war. That their ultimate design is to involve the whole Union in a bloody fratricidal conflict seems to be the only conclusion which can be drawn from their acts."

"Thus the traitors have already unmasked their desperate designs. After this it is idle to deny that their aim is to bring about a forcible disruption of the Union. The nation is in danger from their fratricidal hands! Let every patriot come to the rescue!"

The Ohio Statesman, after reviewing the position of the disunionists, says:

"A factious and treasonable, though accidental majority in the House of Representatives, seem resolved to continue the civil war in Kansas, and to strike down the Army, that the President shall not have power to suppress that violence. Rather than suffer political defeat, they would spread the devastation of civil war all over the northern and southern States. If the leaders of Black Republicanism could rally men enough from the North, they would precipitate upon the South the sanguinary horrors of forcible abolition in the States. To that issue this party is rapidly tending by its every step. Remember, gentlemen, there are two parties to that game, long before your hordes of deluded fanatics can reach the southern border.

"We hope yet that the bloodshed in Kansas shall at once cease. There is a constitutional and legal mode for solving all issues consistently with peace and order. We will go to any length for that purpose. But, if nothing else will do, if this Fremont party is bent on revolution and disunion, now that they foresee their certain doom in November, even so let them come. The Union will find friends in the North, though the contest come in that shape. We speak for the national Democracy of the North, and we know the men. Let the Black Republicans, in the House of Representatives or out of it, look well to the ground on which they stand."

This is strong language, but it is the only language which the course of the fanatics justifies. We will only add one more extract from the Brooklyn Gazette:

"THE ABOLITION PARTY AT WORK—BLOOD FLOWING IN KANSAS.—For some weeks past there has been peace in Kansas. No disturbance occurred, and the demon of discord seemed to have vacated the Territory. All at once the country is startled by repeated and wholesale murders, and this time, at least, there is no attempt made to disguise the fact that the murders were cold, unprovoked assassinations, and are all the work of the 'holy rifle' disciples of abolition."

"These doings are incited, approved, and sanctioned by the whole Fremont Black Republican party, and by its majority in the House of Representatives. They have armed and equipped Colonel Lane and his reckless gang, given them their orders to rob, burn, and assassinate, and now tie up the hands of the Government, that it may be unable to arrest the free-State marauders or protect their victims. Their presses unanimously approve their recent outrages in Kansas, and encourage the House to persist in refusing to pass the appropriation for the Army, so that these predatory bands may continue their depredations unmolested."

[From the Union.]

Black Republican Hypocrisy.

The Black Republican journals and orators, dreading the consequences of their late attempt at revolution, fearing lest the indignation of the people may sweep them down in its wrath, are resorting to every possible means to divert public attention from their heinous plot. The cry of "free Kansas" is again raised with redoubled energy. The "murdered martyrs in the holy cause of freedom" grow like Falstaff's men in Kendall Green, at every enumeration. But they have played the game of blood too often, and magnified the truth too much, to deceive any longer an honest and intelligent people. Besides, we do not intend they shall skulk from the responsibilities of their atrocious schemes of revolution, civil war, and disunion. It is needless for them to assert that their representatives only desired the repeal of the "Draconian laws of Kansas." The statement is false; they know it, and the country knows it. The indisputable evidence is upon record, that each and every one of them voted against taking up the Senate bill which contained a clause repealing the obnoxious laws of Kansas. We have already laid the whole bill before our readers; nevertheless, we reinsert the repealing clause:

"That, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States and the organic act of said Territory have secured to the inhabitants thereof certain inalienable rights, of which they cannot be deprived by any legislative enactments, therefore no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust; no law shall be in force or enforced in said Territory respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition for the redress of grievances; the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the person or things to be seized; nor shall the rights of the people to keep and bear arms be infringed. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall he be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compulsory process

of obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense. The privilege of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended unless when, in case of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it. In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of common law. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. No law shall be made or have force or effect in said Territory which shall require a test oath or oath to support any act of Congress or other legislative act as a qualification for any civil office or public trust, or for any employment or profession, or to serve as a juror, or vote at any election, or which shall impose any tax upon, or condition to, the exercise of the right of suffrage by any qualified voter, or which shall restrain or prohibit the free discussion of any law or subject of legislation in the said Territory, or the free expression of opinion thereon by the people of said Territory."

But this is only one among many of their acts of hypocrisy and deception. Not only did they refuse to take up this bill, with this clause repealing the "Draconian code," thus giving their official sanction to that code, but the false-hearted hypocrites actually voted to ESTABLISH SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORY OF KANSAS—ACTUALLY VOTED FOR THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW, which they have been abusing and denouncing, to the exhaustion of their Billingsgate terms, which are by no means few or delicate.

Here are the provisions for which *every single Black Republican in the House*, except Mr. LEITER, of Ohio, voted:

"*Provided, however*, That any person lawfully held to service in said Territories shall not be discharged from such service by such repeal and revival of said eighth section if such person shall be permanently removed from such Territory or Territories prior to the 1st day of January, 1853; and any child or children born in either of said Territories, of any female lawfully held to service, if in like manner removed without said Territories before the expiration of that date, shall not be, by reason of anything in this act, emancipated from any service it might have owed had this act never been passed.

"*And provided further*, That any person lawfully held to service in any other State or Territory of the United States, and escaping into either the Territory of Kansas or Nebraska, may be reclaimed and removed to the person or place where such service is due, under any law of the United States which shall be in force upon the subject."

We beg our readers to contrast the two provisions. Read the one against which the Black Republicans voted alongside of the one for which they voted, which they voted through the *House over the heads of every national Democrat in that body*; then say who are the advocates of *peace in Kansas*—who the advocates of the "Draconian laws."

But Mr. Leiter did not vote for the bill; and why did he bolt from his whole party? He has answered that question for himself, and we give him the benefit of his reply. It is as follows:

"We passed Dunn's bill for Kansas yesterday in a very objectionable manner. It has many good provisions, but extends the fugitive slave law over Kansas and Nebraska, and perpetuates slavery there until 1853, and makes all children born therein up to that line of slave mothers slaves. This was too much for me. I have always said, and now repeat my pledges, that I will never vote to recognize slavery; I will never vote to make any human being a slave; I will never vote to extend slavery one single foot; I will never vote for the fugitive slave law, or its extension over any free territory; I therefore voted against Dunn's bill, SOLITARY AND ALONE of all our party."

We know that it is almost a hopeless task to attempt to convince any Black Republican of the falsehood and folly of the charges which the leaders of that party are daily manufacturing for circulation; still, we think it well to keep flinging the truth and the record in their faces, that the people may not be deceived. We may give an

antidote, though we fear many of them are past all cure. Many poor, deluded fanatics have repeated the falsehoods furnished them by their masters—the Sowards, Garrisons, Greeleys, *et cetera*—until they really believe them. But the people are neither blind nor corrupt, and to them we appeal, offering the truth from the records as our only argument.

We will remark, in conclusion, that we do not believe that any one of the advocates of the proviso for one moment thought that the President had or has the most distant intention to employ the Army, in or out of Kansas, in enforcing any unconstitutional laws, or otherwise using the military force, except in the most legitimate and justifiable manner, and for the maintenance of peace and the just rights of all classes of citizens.

[From the New York Day Book.]
Bloodshed in Kansas.

It is the glory of our Democratic institutions that, for eighty years—ever since their creation—there has never been a capital conviction for treason, or one drop of blood shed to sustain them. While the wicked and rotten systems of the Old World—the rule of classes, of kings, of aristocrats, &c.—have armed one half of the population, and set them to cutting the throats of the other half whenever they exhibited the slightest desire for freedom, or to vindicate those rights of manhood inherent in the very nature that God himself gave them—while all Europe has often been one vast battle-field, a very Golgotha of blood, and crime and misery unutterable have desolated the fair earth—we have enjoyed perfect peace and boundless prosperity. Our Democratic system, giving to every man his rights—his natural rights—the rights that belong to his manhood—that are inherent—that, in short, are naturally a part of himself, but which are denied or stolen from him all over elsewhere, and thus, as in England, left him only half a man, and often not even as much as that—our system, thus natural and truthful, has worked out consequences the most beneficent and glorious that have ever dawned on the world's vision, or awakened the hopes of its crushed and long-suffering millions. And at no period in our history has there been such boundless prosperity, such proud consciousness of the national greatness, such high hopes of future grandeur, and such universal happiness, as at this moment. But from the far West, on the wings of the wind, comes the raven notes of discord and civil war; blood has been shed in Kansas; there is a stain on the national banner; the glorious old *oriflamme* of Democracy, which, for eighty years, has waved so gently and peacefully over millions of contented freemen, is spotted with the blood of brethren, and desecrated and dishonored by treason.

Who are the traitors? Who are the vile and miserable beings that thus dishonor the nation, that thus disgrace the cause of Democracy, that thus aim their felon blows at the life of the Union and the bosoms of their brothers? They should be and they will be known. History will hand them down to the latest posterity, and, though personally utterly impotent and contemptible, their names will be gibbeted by an immortality of infamy.

Of the twenty or twenty-five millions of citizens who compose this Republic—this Union—this grand Confederacy of freemen—there is not

one single man whose rights or privileges, as a man and citizen, are disturbed, or threatened, or interfered with in any particular whatever, or in the remotest possible degree whatever. This is a truth—a fact—a demonstrable, unmistakable fact—a fact which cannot be gainsayed or disproved, or doubted; which no amount of Abolition falsehood or imposture can distort or disguise a moment, when it is boldly and directly thrust down their lying throats. What, then, is the cause or pretense of the trouble in Kansas, where no man's rights are outraged, where, as an American citizen and freeman, he enjoys all the rights of citizenship, all the Constitution secures to him, all, in fact that nature and the Almighty himself have given him? What, we repeat, is the excuse or pretense for civil war in Kansas? What impels men to shed the blood of their brethren, or to risk their own lives—to raise their parricidal hands against their country—to disgrace their own Government, when not one single right or privilege of citizenship is threatened or interfered with in the remotest manner?

Well, there is a cause of pretense after all, and though reason and common sense would never even dream of such a thing—though patriotism and the spirit of democracy would instantaneously shrink from such a pretense—though nature and the instincts of manhood should revolt with irrepressible and overwhelming disgust from such a cause or excuse—nevertheless it exists, and it is “nigger freedom!”

British aristocrats, hopeless of all other modes or means for breaking up the American Union, and with it the destruction of democratic institutions, long since turned their attention to, and fixed their hopes on, the negro element in our midst. Their writers were set to work to propagate the notion that the negro was a man like ourselves, except in his color, and consequently that the social subordination of the negro was slavery, immoral and monstrous; and British statesmen brought the vast power of their Government—indeed, the whole combined power of European monarchism—to carry out the theories of their writers, and force the whites, Indians, and negroes of this continent to a common level. Except Cuba, they have destroyed, necessarily destroyed, the civilization of the whole of tropical America, which their policy contemplates as the future of a vast negro barbarism, to be wielded when the time comes for the ruin of southern society, and the consequent destruction of American democracy; all, however, disguised under the pretense of “philanthropy,” and termed the “abolition of slavery.” But while devoting so much time and money to this devil's work in the tropics, they did not neglect other means essential to final success, and British agents and tools have been at work for twenty years in forming a party in our midst that would coöperate with them in their infamous designs against the American Union, or, as their dupes and tools say, that would assist them in the “abolition of slavery.”

We do not mean to charge Colonel Frémont, or the great body of his supporters, with unfaithfulness to our institutions. He has given the best possible evidence of patriotism and love of country that a man can give; and no one has a right to charge masses of men with treason. But that a certain and active portion of his supporters—those whom Sumner, Giddings, &c., lead and represent—are traitors, British traitors, double-

died, and the meanest and most contemptible of all possible traitors, or of all the traitors ever known on the face of the earth, we do not doubt for a moment. They are debauched and demoralized, and denationalized by their British and negro affiliations. They have read British books, and imbibed British opinions, British feelings, and even British prejudices; and if they were to openly and honestly avow their real sentiments, they would say—as indeed not a few of them do say—that they would rejoice in accepting British institutions, if they could thus get rid of “slavery;” or, in other words, they would go for artificial distinctions among white men, in order to affiliate or equalize with negroes. They are the authors and getters up of the “civil war” in Kansas; and though themselves cowards—for an Abolitionist, as Colonel Brooks says, is *per se*, and in the nature and necessities of things, a coward—they strive with all their might to mislead others, and induce them to shed the blood of those they hate, with all the bitter malignancy of a British monarchist, but have not manhood enough themselves to face the consequences of their mean vindictiveness. These are the men, and this the cause of the Kansas troubles. They are the dupes and tools of the enemies of our institutions—the miserable toadies and flunkies of British aristocrats—the emasculated and unmanned “friends of freedom,” or of free niggerism; and when the delusion of the hour passes away, and the northern masses comprehend this matter, the object and end of these Kansas troubles, and understand how such poltroons and traitors as Sumner and Burlingame, and their vile associates, have betrayed and insulted them—have sought to embroil them in a civil war with their brethren—to shed the blood of their southern brothers—to dishonor the nation, and for such a “cause,” for nigger freedom—to bring about a hideous and revolting equality with negroes—when, we repeat, the time comes, and these things are truly understood, the “friends of freedom” will be lynched as promptly and remorselessly at the North as they now would be at the South, should they venture their dishonored and cowardly carcasses within its borders.

[From the Washington Union.]

Is there Danger?

We are aware that, among a large mass of the good and patriotic citizens of our land, there is a strong belief in the eternal stability of our noble institutions—in the indestructibility of our beloved Union. The noblest and the basest motives—the extremes of patriotism and treason—combine to strengthen this belief. Those who love the Union, who desire to see its blessings perpetuated to all time, cherish the belief that it will be so—that it is too deeply planted in the affections of the people for any human power to destroy it. On the other hand, they who loathe and abhor, who spurn and spit upon, the Union, are in like manner zealous for the spread of this overweening confidence in its stability. They would lull to rest the watchful jealousy of all honest and patriotic people, that they may the more effectively and securely work out their treason. They hope to deceive the people, whom they know they cannot corrupt. Time and again have we warned the people of the treasonable designs of these mad fanatics; and many there are—good, sober-minded men—who have been

aroused to a consciousness of the danger which is almost upon us; yet there are many who meet all appeals to their patriotism, all exhortations to their vigilance, with the constant cry of *PEACE! PEACE!* when each day and hour brings new proof that there is no peace; that unless the people rise up in their might and majesty to drive back the tide of fanaticism and disunion—to scourge it from out the borders of our land—there can never more be peace.

Let it not be a reason and a reliance that, because we have escaped more than once, when the wisest of our statesmen and the sternest of our patriots believed we were on the verge of a dissolution, that we shall escape now. Those who would thus delude themselves should remember that we were saved then only by the mightiest efforts of those great and good men. They should likewise remember that one by one these giant patriots have paid the great debt of nature, until scarce one is left to raise a protecting arm around the Constitution; and, more than all, they should remember that the few who remain of that venerable band, with sad foreboding and earnest supplications, are warning their countrymen of the fate which must inevitably come upon our Union, unless the people arouse themselves to its defense.

Let our old men turn back their recollections to early times, when a dissolution of the Union was first agitated, and when it was considered treason. The danger and the crime were so revolting that the instigators spoke of it in whispers, and scarcely dared to trust their own thoughts. Let them look back to the war of 1812, when political and sectional intolerance essayed its disloyalty to the Union, and how sternly it was rebuked by the insulted majesty of the people. Let them remember when the subject of disunion first invaded the Halls of Congress as a debatable idea, and how like treason it was treated. Let them trace how insidiously it gained a foothold as a political element, and emboldened partisans to repudiate the idea that crime attached to it. Let them see how far we have departed from the virtue and patriotism of our fathers, by turning away from their pure example like prodigal sons. Let them see how rank the growth of treason is throughout the land, and the boldness with which that name is blotted out, and its principles claimed and practiced as virtues. Let not the people shut their eyes to the fact that a great sectional party is struggling for the Presidency, and using every measure that can provoke sectional prejudices, and endanger the integrity of the Union. Let them not blink the fact, that this party avows that it is better that the "Union should slide" than that their distinctive principles should not triumph. Let them not forget that it has struck from our national banner fifteen of its glorious and consecrated stars. Let them look to the revolutionary and disorganizing course of this party during the last regular session of Congress, and the called session. Let them mark how perseveringly they provoke civil war, and make it a stalking-horse over fields of blood, in pursuit of party power.

When we contemplate all these overt acts of disloyalty to the Union, how can any unprejudiced mind arrive at the conclusion the Union is safe and beyond the reach of treason?

Shall we refuse to heed the rise and fall of nations, and take no lessons from their teaching?

Republics, in the hands of the people, were of the number, with no better fate than despotisms. Our waning patriotism and growing licentiousness give no encouragement to our faith or strength to our hopes that we shall be blessed with long life and abundant prosperity.

Why is it that the monarchies and despotisms of the Old World are at this hour chuckling at our discord, and felicitating their iron grasp on civil and religious liberty, that our Union is shaking to its foundation? The London Times is exultant; and the London Chronicle speaks thus:

"We should be sorry to see Mr. Buchanan elected, because he is in favor of preserving the obnoxious institutions as they exist, and the unity of the States. There is no safety for European monarchical government if the progressive spirit of the democracy of the United States is allowed to succeed. Elect Frémont, and the first blow to the separation of the United States is effected!"

The Paris Moniteur, the official organ of the Emperor, says:

"Our sympathies are entirely with Colonel Frémont. We hope to see no extension of the Democratic principles in the United States. It is dangerous to European Governments."

These Governments are watching us with sleepless vigilance, and they know our condition minutely and thoroughly. They see our danger; and if they can move a finger to provoke it, it will be done.

In conclusion, we ask the country to wake up to its true condition, and save the rich heritage of our fathers from the dangers that environ it, and be not cheated by those who cry Peace! Peace! when there is no peace.

[From the Union.]

The Black Republicans intend to Dissolve the Union.

When we see a man strike at his fellow-man with a knife, we take the action to be proof of the intention to murder, and reject the denial of the offender. If we discover the felon who is applying the torch to his neighbor's dwelling, though the fire may die out, or be extinguished by the hand of a better man, we accuse the perpetrator of being an incendiary, and would not take the excuse, if he were to make it, that he was only trying an experiment to see whether his matches were good, and that he intended at the right time to put out the fire himself. But we would not believe him.

The truth is a conviction of the mind which is compulsory. There is no pretense; no affectation; there is nothing artificial about it, and the mind is satisfied by demonstration, and but one conclusion can follow. Therefore we do not believe the excuse of the felon taken in the act. In other words, the truth prevails, and it is mighty, simply because its moral power cannot be resisted. This is the law which our Creator has implanted in the human mind. When we apply these rules to the conduct of the Black Republican party, our conclusions will be no less certain, and our judgment will be equally just.

With this programme, let us see how they will abide the test of summing up.

In the very initiative of this canvass for the Presidency they drew a sectional line, and did not seem even to be disturbed by the first emotion of a desire to pass beyond its limits. Their earliest allies were among the wildest Abolitionists, who affected to despise and denounce the Bible, and not less to spurn the Union of these States,

and to proclaim its early dissolution. To add to this, their favorite young leader, Mr. Banks, began the campaign with a very significant announcement in the imperative mood—"Let the Union slide." He now holds the highest office which, since that time, has been within their gift. His power with them, from that hour, has never lessened, but has been increased, and at this moment he is the master spirit of their combination.

Between him and the other young and ardent Catilines of their secret councils, and between them and an old and arch-traitor from the Democratic ranks, who once edited its organ, the project was conceived of planning a sectional party which should not be offended by the introduction of a single national element. By being made exclusive, it was believed that it would be of easier control, and would be susceptible of a more intense excitement and concentration. The plot once matured, they looked out for some wild, reckless, and daring adventurer, around whom there might be just mystery enough to inflame curiosity, and a notoriety sufficient to have made his name familiar. It was not material to them whether he should be the equal of Mungo Park, or that he should have the profound philosophy of Humboldt. It would be enough that they could swear him to be the rival of both, and as having some graces for speculation, either in politics, religion, morals, or finance, of which they could not claim an equal knowledge and as high a reputation. But in him must be found at least one single feature, which should be like and peculiar to their sworn affiliation. The machiavelian teacher in politics, who deserted the Democrats because they would no longer patronize him, and whose experience and dexterity fitted him for the task of a prime counsellor, might supply the ways and means for that. The pupil was, therefore, early advised of the importance of being put into communication with the rebellious and disorganizing spirits of Kansas; and believing himself to be a hopeful aspirant for becoming a Chief Magistrate, he soon found occasion to express in a formal letter to the bogus Governor Robinson, of Kansas, his deep sympathies for the work of abolition and disunion, which was then progressing in that ill-fated Territory, under the Christian and generous auspices of the Emigrant Aid Society of Massachusetts. Such was the process of preparation, and John C. Frémont became a fit candidate for the Black Republican nomination. In sketching this brief notice of the preparation which that party was making to wield, if possible, successfully, the knife against a brother, and for using the torch to destroy a neighbor, we must not forget the episode which was enacted in the progress of the scene. The name of John McLean, a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was brought forward by some personal friends for the favor and confidence of the Black Republicans. But, unhappily, the letter which he wrote sealed his fate. In that he expressed his devotion to the Union, and intimated something which seemed to be intended to mean that a just administration of the affairs of the Government should be carefully guarded. His doom was fixed. His name, if not actually spurned from the Black Republican convention, was rejected in a manner which evinced the disgust of the leaders, and their impatience of any delay at proceeding to the consummation of their

projects. His youthful rival, a citizen of New York or California, as he might elect, was nominated as their candidate for President. A citizen of New Jersey was placed on the ticket for the Vice Presidency. After this achievement, it was not long until the flag of sixteen stars was hoisted as an emblem of the party. With this flag, and the battle-cry of that other youthful and talented leader—"Let the Union slide"—the party have entered the contest before the whole American people, but only seeking the votes of the northern States. At the very next step we find the same party, in one solid mass, in the House of Representatives, refusing the annual supplies for the support of the Army. We have heretofore explained the consequences of this act to be the virtual disbanding of the troops, the disorganization of the Government, civil war, and the final dissolution of the Union. They have proceeded in a regular gradation of acts, beginning at an early day, to prepare everything, to have each man placed in a suitable position, in which he was to play his part, and having the party thoroughly drilled for the final accomplishment of their conspiracy.

The full development of that conspiracy has now been made.

The proof is as clear as that he who strikes with his knife at his fellow-man intends murder—as clear as that he who applies the torch to his neighbor's dwelling is an incendiary. The truth stands out before us in illuminated letters; the conviction upon the mind is resistless; and before the great American people we arraign the Black Republican party of being guilty of conspiracy against the Union, and designing to accomplish their wicked purposes by involving the North and the South in civil war.

We have rapidly traced the conception and progress of their plot, and, with this indictment against them, we appeal to the patriotic men of America—especially do we appeal to our northern brethren, who have the power to strangle these ambitious conspirators before they shall have attained such gigantic proportions as shall be beyond their strength. We ask our northern countrymen whether they are willing that a dissolution of this Union shall take place? Will you cast your votes for a party who will bathe the banner of their country in the blood of its citizens? Are you prepared for the fire to be applied to the dwelling of one *single family*, or the sword to be plunged into the breast of a *solitary citizen*? Robbery, too, will riot in wanton cruelty throughout the land, and all the calamities of which you have heard and read, that have befallen other nations, will come upon us. It is with mad ambition like this that other countries have been destroyed; and you, who are the most blessed and prosperous people on the earth, can, if you will, save yourselves. It is with you of the North to say, shall this be done? Remember your kindred are everywhere over this broad land. The man of Maine can rise up and say my brother and his children dwell in the far South; and he of the South can likewise claim that his father and his mother, and a host of his kindred, are in the North. Shall this war amongst brethren come upon us, and be worse than pestilence or famine?

We are fully aware of the responsibility of our position, and we do not make this appeal lightly. We see and know the danger by which we are

surrounded; and, knowing it, we feel it our duty to declare it, to warn our countrymen, to appeal to them as men, as brothers, and as patriots; and if our brethren of the North are true to their own interests, to the affections of their hearts, to the ties which bind them to country and to kindred, with one great effort they will hurl to the dust the conspirators who now, with their ambitious projects, threaten the dissolution of this Union.

[From the New York Day Book.]

The Democratic Position.

There never was a Presidential canvass where the Democratic position was so distinct and positive as at the present time, and yet, strange enough, there never has been a canvass where the real issue involved was so misrepresented and so misunderstood. The position is *non-intervention*—that Congress shall not *intercede* or meddle with so-called slavery. That is all—exactly all—the whole question, and it would seem so plain, and so reasonable, and so just to “North” and “South,” and all classes and conditions of our people, that not one single citizen should be or would be opposed to it.

The Democratic idea necessarily leads to this position. Democracy is equality—not a forced or factitious equality, or an equality brought about by legal enactments, or that assumes to compel the wise and foolish, the moral and immoral, the good and the bad, to stand together on a common level, but that leaves all men perfectly free to ascend or to descend in the social scale just as they please, or just as their industry, cultivation, moral worth, or usefulness to their fellows merit. It assumes that all men are naturally equal, and therefore entitled to equal rights as well as equally responsible for the due performance of common duties; and with unbounded confidence in the intelligence and virtue of the people, the Democratic party holds that government the best which governs the least. Or, in other words, it trusts to the individual man rather than the machine called the Government, and always labors to enlarge the sphere of action to the former, and to circumscribe it in the case of the latter. Thus, from the beginning of the national existence, or from the day of its organization, the Democracy have labored to reform and simplify the machinery of government in the States, and in respect to national politics, have strictly construed the Federal Constitution and confined the Federal power to the few objects designed by its founders. That the Federal Government has no right whatever to legislate on the subject of so-called slavery in the national Territories, except to protect the rights of property that may attach or be involved in that subject, would seem to be so self-evident and unmistakable, that no one would have the folly or the audacity to dispute it, nor indeed would any one assume such an absurd position, if it were not for the widespread ignorance and misconception which prevail.

The Constitution defines, with perfect exactness, the extent of the Federal power in respect to “slavery.” It provides for the indirect representation of the negro, or “slave” population, and the restoration of “fugacious” or absconding “slaves.” That is all; and in everything else touching this negro, or “slave” population, Congress or the Federal Government is as wholly

and completely disconnected as it is with the serfdom of Russia or the industrial slavery of England.

And aside from the constitutional question, or when the subject is contemplated from a merely moral view, there is something absolutely infamous in the assumption of a northern party to exclude the “South” from the common territory. The federation of States is *accidentally* composed of two great sections with seemingly widely separated and opposing social systems, though in point of fact there is no conflict or contradiction whatever. The “South” has an inferior race, which demands, of course, a corresponding social adaptation. The “North,” with a homogeneous population, presents, on the surface of things, quite a different aspect, of course. But while this external appearance varies so widely, there is no conflict whatever; and if a Republican, or Abolitionist, or Traitor, or British tool, or whatever he should be called in reality, were to live a thousand years, and had the intellectual power of a Webster, he could give no one single sound reason for excluding so-called “slavery” from the national Territories.

If the “South” were to assume to exclude the “North” from the Territories, it would be thought a great absurdity, but it would be less absurd, and infinitely less unjust than this assumption of the “North,” or of a party at the “North,” to exclude the “South.” The latter mainly acquired the Territories. It was the Jeffersons, and Monroes, and Tylers, and Polks of the South that acquired these Territories, and directly in the teeth of the very party and very men at the North who now claim the right to monopolize them. If the South were to combine together and say, “we think our system of society, composed of superior and inferior races, organized on the basis of their natural relations, the best adapted to human well-being—that it, and it alone, has thus far, at least, secured the liberty and practical equality of our own race, while it has worked out an equally relative good in the inferior race, and, therefore as we mainly acquired the national Territories, we shall insist on extending our beneficent social system, and northern men coming into the Territory, must bring negro servants with them, or we will exclude them;” if, we repeat, the South were to talk thus, it would be, however absurd it may seem, infinitely less unjust than that which the Searwards and Sumners assume to do in this matter. But the “South” assumes no such position. It does not wish to exclude from the national Territories any portion of the northern people. It is willing that even those who opposed their acquisition shall enjoy them, and be protected in them in all their rights as American citizens.

It does not ask Congress to give it any special or additional right in the Territories. It demands only “hands off”—that the Constitution be strictly construed—that the common Government—its own Government—the very Government that its own sons created, or mainly created, shall not be converted into an engine of oppression, or wielded to exclude southern men from Territories which they themselves acquired.

The northern Democracy, who have always acted harmoniously and kindly with their southern brethren, are, of course, anxious and willing to stand by the South—to admit claims so just and moderate—to rely upon a strict construction of the Federal Constitution—to confine the Fed-

erel Government within its well-defined limits—to keep it from interfering with the subject of “slavery”—in short, to prevent those who opposed the acquisition of the Territories from excluding any portion of the people who may desire to settle in them. That is the position of the Democratic party—a position of simple non-intervention—and it would seem so plain and unmistakable, that no one would have the hardihood to deny it, or the folly to try to controvert it.

But back of all this is another question, or rather another difficulty. It is admitted at the North that so-called “slavery,” or the social relations of southern society, is wrong, immoral, unnatural—in short, slavery; and thus the whole question is given up at the start, and the vile creatures who, consciously or unconsciously, are doing the work of British aristocrats and European monarchists, the Giddings, Sumners, Hales, &c., and assume to exclude the “South” from Kansas, appear to the northern people honest and patriotic citizens, who desire to save the Territories from an admitted evil. If the veil that now blinds the North were lifted, and the people could see this thing as it really is, or if means were taken to enlighten the northern mind on the subject of “slavery,” the Burlingames and Greeleys would be lynched by the very crowds that now so clamorously cheer them as patriots and “friends of freedom.” And whatever the immediate result of the present misconception and delusion of the North, the time will come when not one single man within its broad limits will acknowledge himself such a fool, or such a knave, or such a contemptible tool of the enemies of Democracy, as to assume to exclude any portion of our people from the common territory, or to deny the perfect soundness and truthfulness of the Democratic position of *non-intervention*.

Black Republican Convention.

The following are some of the sentiments of the members of the Black Republican Abolition Convention that nominated Frémont:

JOHN P. HALE

was there, the Abolition candidate for President against Scott and Pierce, in 1852. What is his record? On the 7th of February, 1850, he presented, insisted upon, and, along with Chase and Seward alone, voted to receive, refer, and consider a petition demanding of Congress “an immediate dissolution of the Union,” because a union with slaveholders is violative of divine law and human rights. On the 23d of March, 1848, he presented a batch of eighty petitions at once, demanding the same thing.

SALMON P. CHASE.

was there by letter, and originally a candidate—afterwards a zealous supporter of Frémont for nomination. For his record, let the columns of the Dayton Journal, last fall, answer. He is an original old-line Abolitionist, in favor of negro suffrage and negro equality; opposed to constitutional provisions for the rendition of fugitive slaves; in favor of excluding all slaveholders from office; believes that slavery in the States would not continue a year after the accession of the anti-slavery party to power; and thinks that it ought to be abolished by the constitutional power of Congress and the State Legislatures.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD

was there, first as a candidate, and afterwards as one of Frémont's warmest supporters. Indeed, it is well known that to Chase, Seward, and Greeley, Frémont is mainly indebted for his nomination; they defeated McLean. “When Henry Wilson mentioned the name of Seward,” says the correspondent of the Pittsburg Gazette, “the whole convention arose to its feet, gave the Senator three times three, and he would have been nominated for President by acclamation.” And now hear him on sectional parties:

“Slavery is not, and never can be, perpetual. It will be overthrown either peacefully and lawfully under this Constitution, or it will work the subversion of the Constitution together with its own overthrow. The House of Representatives is already yours; it always must be when you choose to have it. The Senate of the United States is equally within your power, if you will only work persistently for two years. Notwithstanding all the wrong that has been done, not another slave State can now come into the Union. Make only one year's constant decisive effort, and you can determine what State shall be admitted.

“It is written in the Constitution of the United States that five slaves shall count equal to three freemen, as a basis of representation; and it is written, also, in violation of the Divine law, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave. You blush not at these things, because they are as familiar as household words.” * * *

“There is a higher law than the Constitution which regulates our authority over the domain.” * * * “It (slavery) can and must be abolished, and you and I must do it.” *

“Correct your own error, that slavery has constitutional guarantees which may not be released, and ought not to be relinquished.” * * * “You will soon bring the parties of the country into an effective aggression upon slavery.”

BENJAMIN F. WADE

is a supporter of Frémont, and a leader of the party. Hear him:

“He thought there was but one issue before the people, and that was the question of American slavery. He said the Whig party is not only dead, but stinks. It shows signs occasionally of convulsive spasms, as is sometimes exhibited in the dead snake's tail, after the head and body have been buried.

“There is really no union now between the North and South; and he believed no two nations upon the earth entertain feelings of more bitter rancor towards each other than these two nations of the Republic. The only salvation of the Union, therefore, was to be founded in divesting it entirely from all taint of slavery.”

NATHANIEL P. BANKS,

the “Union-slider” Speaker of the Abolition House of Representatives, is a leader of the Frémont party, and was withdrawn from the candidacy of the Know Nothing Seceders' Convention to make way for Frémont. Hear him:

“Although I am not one of that class of men who cry for the perpetuation of the Union, though I am willing, in a certain state of circumstances, to let it slide, I have no fear for its perpetuation. But let me say that, if the chief object of the people of this country is to maintain and propagate chattel property in man, in other words, human slavery, this Union cannot and ought not to stand.”

HORACE MANN

is a supporter of Frémont. Hear him:

“In conclusion, I have only to add that such is my solemn and abiding conviction of the character of slavery, that, under a full sense of my responsibility to my country and my God, I deliberately say, better disunion—better civil or servile war—better anything that God in his providence shall send—than an extension of the bonds of slavery.”

HENRY WILSON

is a leader of the Frémont party, and was present, and spoke at the Philadelphia convention, where he was received with unbounded applause. Hear him:

“Let us remember that more than three millions of bondsmen, groaning under nameless woes, demand that

we shall reprove each other, and that we labor for their deliverance." * * * * *

"I tell you here to-night, that the agitation of this question of human slavery will continue while the foot of a slave presses the soil of the American Republic."

CHARLES SUMNER,

the "illustrious sorehead" of Massachusetts, is a leader and a martyr of the Frémont party: his blood is to be the seed of the party. Hear him:

"The good citizen, as he reads the requirements of this act—the fugitive slave law—is filled with horror." * * *

"Here the path of duty is clear. I am bound to disobey this act." * * * * *

"Sir, I will not dishonor this home of the pilgrims, and of the Revolution, by admitting—nay, I cannot believe—that this bill will be executed here."

RUFUS P. SPAULDING

was a member and leader of the convention. Hear him:

"In the case of the alternative being presented of the continuance of slavery or a dissolution of the Union, I am for dissolution, and I care not how quick it comes."

HON. ERASTUS HOPKINS,

of Massachusetts, was a member of the convention. Hear him:

"If peaceful means fail us, and we are driven to the last extremity where ballots are useless, then we'll make bullets effective. [Tremendous applause.]"

GENERAL JAMES WATSON WEBB

was a leader in the convention. Hear him in a speech on the floor:

"On the action of this convention depends the fate of the country; if the Republicans fall at the ballot-box, we will be forced to drive back the slaveocracy with fire and sword. [Cheers.]"

What the Leaders say!—Sentiments, Opinions, and Declarations of the Republican or Abolition Party.

The old Abolitionists, who, twenty-five years ago, were unable to utter their disunion sentiments, even in Boston, without endangering their necks, as did Garrison when he was dragged from Faneuil Hall, with his neck haltered, are the sub-soil or back-bone of this party which supports Frémont. But they manage to keep a little ahead, and avow their purposes rather more boldly than do the political demagogues and the masses they lead, and whom their treasonable and fanatical sentiments have aroused to their present alarming position. Hear what Wendell Phillips, one of their number, said in his remarks on the 4th of July, 1856:

"No man, Mr. Chairman, has a right to be surprised at the present state of things. It is just what we have attempted to bring about; my friend Swamy was telling us this morning what slavery has done. She has stolen Texas, crushed Kansas, usurped the Government, left the presidential chair empty. What has she done? She has done just exactly what we have been tempting her to do—that is, she has developed herself. The slave power had always the same power, and the same wish; it is the anti-slavery enterprise that has developed that wish into an act. It is just what we expected, exactly. The forces, at last, are ranged face to face. Our friends have not turned to the bright side of the matter to-day; but there is merit in the Republican party. It is this: It is the

FIRST SECTIONAL PARTY EVER ORGANIZED IN THIS COUNTRY. IT DOES NOT KNOW ITS OWN FACE, AND IT CALLS ITSELF NATIONAL; BUT IT IS NOT NATIONAL, IT IS SECTIONAL. IT IS THE NORTH ARRAYED AGAINST THE SOUTH. Henry Wilson said to me: 'We must get every one of the northern States in order to elect Frémont.' Even in imagination he did not count upon a single southern State. It was a distinct recognition of the fact that the Republican party is a party of the North, PLEDGED AGAINST THE SOUTH. Theodore Parker wanted to know once where disunion would begin. I will tell him: just where that party divides. That is a northern party against the southern. I do not call it an anti-slavery party; it has not risen to that yet. It is a northern party against the southern. They made the first little breach. The first crack in the iceberg is visible; you will hear it go, with a crack, through to the center. Its first distinct recognition was Banks's election. He was elected by northern men, not a man from the South voting for him. That is the value of that party. I hail it as a sign—a great gain. I did not hope to see it for ten years; it has come unexpectedly early."

ABOLITION IN THE STATES.

"Admit that **ABOLITION IN THE STATES** is what all men OUGHT to strive for, and it is clear to our mind that a large majority is not prepared for this; and the **PRACTICAL** question is this: Shall we politically attempt what will certainly involve us in **DEFEAT** and **FAILURE**? or shall we rather attempt what a majority are **RIPE** for, and thus beyond consequent **TRIUMPH**, invite **THAT** majority to go **FURTHER**? Shall we insist on having **ALL** the possible eggs now, or shall we be content to await their **APPEARANCE** day by day? The latter seems to us the only rational, sensible course. We care not how **FAST** Messrs. Birney & Co. may ripen public sentiment in the North for emancipation; we will **JUD THEM TO THE BEST OF OUR ABILITY**, but will not refuse good now, when in our reach, out of deference to that which is as yet unattainable. Mr. Birney's 'ultimatum' may be just what he sees fit; we have not proposed to **MODIFY** or meddle with it. We only ask that he shall not interdict or prevent the doing good **AT ONCE**, merely because he would like to do **MORE GOOD—AS WE SHALL ALSO, WHENEVER IT SHALL BECOME PRACTICABLE.**"
—Horace Greeley, in the New York Tribune.

BRITISH BAYONETS.

"I look forward to the day when there shall be a servile insurrection in the South—when the black man, armed with British bayonets, and led on by British officers, shall assert his freedom, and wage a war of extermination against his master—when the torch of the incendiary shall light up the towns and cities of the South, and blot out the last vestige of slavery; and though I may not mock at their calamity, nor laugh when their fear cometh, yet I will hail it as the dawn of a political millennium."—Joshua R. Giddings.

A COLLISION HOPED FOR.

"Political action is just now our greatest evil—our greatest danger. We are looking after ballots, when our eyes should be fixed on bayonets. We are counting votes when we should be mustering armed men. We are looking after the interests of civil rulers, when we should be seeking after military rulers. I only hope, sir, to hear

that there has been a collision at Topeka. I only want to hear that there has been a collision between the free-State men and the Federal troops, and that northern men have fallen; and then will soon follow the gratifying intelligence that the northern States have arrayed themselves against the Federal Government in Kansas. And will that be the end? No! Missouri will be the battle-field, and then slavery will be driven to the wall."—*Gerrit Smith, at Buffalo, who has recently written a letter in favor of Frémont.*

ABOLITION PREDICTIONS.

"Among the many predictions which they have uttered, or rather the many statements they have made, as to what must come to pass, the one which five or six years ago seemed the wildest, was the necessary division of the nation into two parts—the northern and the southern—of which the principles should be slavery and anti-slavery. Five years ago, what seemed more unlikely than that the nation should be divided into strictly sectional parties as it is now? But the lines are now drawn and the hosts are encamped over against each other. The attempt to keep up a delusive alliance with natural enemies has been abandoned. The Abolitionists have been telling these things in the ears of the people for a quarter of a century. They have had a double part in what has come to pass, both by preparing the minds of the people of the North, and by compelling the people of the South to the very atrocities which have startled the North into attention. Nothing but the madness which ushers in destruction, and the pride that goeth before a fall, on the part of the slaveholders, could have roused the sluggish North from its comfortable dreams of wealth, and made it put itself into a position of resistance. The North is in a state of excitement, temporary, perhaps, but real for the time, and the widening lines of division between the North and the South are growing deep and distinct. It is long since this paper took the ground that the first thing, though by no means the only thing needful, was the formation of sectional parties—of parties distinctly northern and southern, and, of necessity, slavery and anti-slavery. We rejoice that our eyes behold the day of that beginning of the end. The position is everything. It is the attitude that is expressive and encouraging. It is the entire separation of the party from all southern alliance, and from all possibility of slaveholding help, that gives it its encouraging aspect, and makes it, with all its short-comings, a thing to thank God for."—*New York Anti-Slavery Standard, July 21st, supported by British funds.*

APPEAL TO ABOLITIONISTS.

"Now here, in this 1856, is a party, with a fair chance of electing its candidates, so far anti-slavery that it cannot expect a vote in any slave State, except as the result of a virtual anti-slavery revolution in such State. It makes no bid for a southern vote. To be sure, it does not present a radical Abolition platform, going beyond the Constitution, and perhaps not an Abolitionist for a candidate, but a man whose antecedents do show that he may safely be trusted to defend every inch of free soil for free men. These facts are such as have not existed in any previous presidential contest, and they impose upon wise and good men, such as we believe the radical Abolitionists to be, a new duty. It is, to take hold and do all

they can to elect Frémont and Dayton."—*Boston Chronicle, the Frémont organ of Boston.*

GEMS FROM GARRISON.

"The whole nation has sympathized with the loss of the Pacific. It is sad to think of the loss of lives, but I would rather have a Pacific go down every day than what transpires every day in one of the southern States of our Union."—*Garrison.*

"The Christ of America is a slave-holding, a slave-dealing, and a slave-hunting Christ, and we will not have such a Christ to reign over us. We have a tremendous power to grapple with."—*Garrison.*

"While the Tribune has a large circulation, remember the odds in regard to the northern press. Nine tenths of them are against slavery agitation. The majority are unfriendly to a general attack upon the slave power."—*Garrison.*

"I am for dissolving the Union, and letting slavery go. We have no Union with slavery. We cannot worship at the same shrine, or believe in the same God. We are opposed to slavery, and they are hostile to freedom. The slaveholders are assassins, without law."—*Garrison.*

"This Union is a lie. The American Union is an imposture, a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell." * * * * *

"I am for its overthrow!" * * * * * "Up with the flag of disunion, that we may have a free and glorious Republic of our own; and when the hour shall come, the hour will have arrived that shall witness the overthrow of slavery."—*William Lloyd Garrison.*

SPITTING UPON WASHINGTON.

"Remembering he was a slaveholder, he could spit upon Washington. [Hisses and applause.] The hissers, he said, were slaveholders in spirit, and every one of them would enslave him if they had the courage to do it. So near th Faneuall Hall and Bunker Hill, was he not permitted to say that that scoundrel, George Washington, had enslaved his fellow-men?"—*C. L Remond, Black Republican orator at Faneuil Hall.*

GETTING RID OF FREEDOM.

"The events of the last few years and months and days have taught us the lessons of centuries. I do not see how a barbarous community and a civilized community can constitute one State. I think we must get rid of slavery, or we must get rid of freedom."—*R. W. Emerson, at Concord.*

IMMEDIATE SEPARATION.

"Cannot a convention of wise and prudent men from the free States be had, to take into consideration the propriety of their IMMEDIATE SEPARATION from the slave-breeding and slave-whipping States."—*Pronunciamiento from Dissolution Hill, in the New Haven Palladium, and in the Cowier.*

"I have no doubt that the free and slave States ought to separate."—*J. S. Pike, of the New York Tribune.*

"We earnestly request Congress, at its present session, to take such initiatory measures for the speedy, peaceable, and equitable dissolution of the existing Union, as the exigencies of the case may require."—*Black Republican petition to Congress.*

AWAY WITH THE UNION.

"I love the Union—and the time has come when we must declare we love freedom better

than the Union."—*Ex-Lieutenant Governor Ford, of Ohio.*

"The Union is not worth supporting, in connection with the South."—*Horace Greeley.*

THE DEATH STRUGGLE.

Thus he (Rev. Dr. Kirk) only pointed to the thunder-cloud that hung over us. "God," said he, "may avert it. Man cannot avert it. Coaxing, compromise, letting alone, are all too late. Mr. Brooks is nothing in this matter. Mr. Douglas is nothing in this matter. The doctrine that a negro is not a man, and the doctrine that the negro is a man, have now come to the death struggle, and the nation will have with every convulsive struggle of the contest. Neither will yield until a continent has been swept with the deluge of civil war."—*Traveler's Report of Rev. Dr. Kirk's Speech.*

GENERAL DESTRUCTION.

"Resolved, That—God helping us—we will live and labor not only for the prevention of slavery upon the soil of Kansas, but also for its destruction from the length and breadth of the land.

"Resolved, That the Union was established to secure the liberties of American citizens. When it fails to do that, our only voice can be—let the Union be dissolved."—*Lowell Resolutions.*

REVOLUTIONIZE THE GOVERNMENT.

"It is the duty of the North, in case they fail in electing a President and a Congress that will restore freedom to Kansas, to revolutionize the Government."—*Resolution of a Black Republican Meeting in Wisconsin.*

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer.]

Is the Black Republican Party Sectional?

Extract of a speech of Hon. George W. Julian, of Indiana, at a Frémont meeting at Greenville, Darke county, Ohio, Wednesday evening, September 10, 1856:

"It is no use to deny it any longer, our Republican party is a sectional party, because the South has forced us into it. The stampers of this old-line, horse-stealing Democracy, not having the fear of God before their eyes, charge us with being sectional. I tell you we are a sectional party. It is not alone a fight between the North and the South. It is a fight between freedom and slavery—between God and the Devil—between heaven and hell." [Loud applause.]

The Hon. George W. Julian, who made the above frank admission, is one of the most distinguished and prominent Black Republicans in the United States. He was the candidate of the Abolitionists for Vice President, with John P. Hale for President, in 1852, and is now the principal Frémont orator in Indiana. His testimony, therefore, is not likely to be gainsayed or repudiated by his own partisans, some of whom have hitherto denied, in the face of the most overwhelming and patent proof of its truth, that the Frémont Abolition organization was sectional. Yes, they have denied it, although their party has no existence south of a geographical line; although in their nominating convention only one (the northern) section of the Confederacy was represented; and although their platform tenders a sectional issue upon sectional grounds. They have denied it, although their political appeals are all made to the North, and are filled with the most bitter and scurrilous attacks upon the South, to awaken a prejudice against which their principal element of strength lies.

Mr. Julian knows them to be facts, and, with

more honesty than many of his co-laborers in the cause of disunion, confesses it.

The Rev. Theodore Parker, too, another prominent Frémont orator, was also frank when, at a Black Republican meeting in New York, a few months ago, he thus expressed himself in regard to the sectional character of the Black Republican organization. Parker, according to the report in the New York Tribune, the great oracle of the "freedom shriekers," said:

"But rather than one more fugitive slave should be sent back, I would let the Union be broken into fragments no larger than the space upon which this building stands; and then I would place myself upon a little piece of free-soil which was not contaminated with my brother's blood. But it seems to me that the dissolution of the Union is unnecessary. Let us see what we can do without disturbing it. The free States can choose for their officers men who are men—men made by Nature, and not by Nature's journey-men. Then let New York pass a personal liberty bill, refusing to give up a fugitive slave, and that every slave shall be free when he steps upon our soil; then to pass a law to punish kidnappers by imprisonment in our State prison; then punish those who are in the American slave trade the same as you do those in the African slave trade.

"All this they could do in Albany without violating the Constitution, for you are a sovereign State and have a right to interpret the Constitution for yourselves. Then, in a national point of view, repeal all fugitive slave bills. Then abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and all the Territories. Abolish the entire slave trade and make it piracy. Then make slaveholding incapacitate a man from holding any office. Then reconstruct the United States judiciary; they need not remove the judge from office, but remove the office from the man. Then, in their places, I would take honest men who love God and love men, and then the Constitution would no longer be a pro-slavery document. There are things in that document that are bad things, which I would tread under my feet. But there are other things which are noble, and they preponderate. Then, at last, I would decree a day, fixed and certain, when each State should abolish slavery, and, if they did not do it, the government should take possession of them and form a republican Government. In the next six months, we can place a Republican man in the presidential chair, and, if that is accomplished, freedom will triumph."

Fellow-citizens, those of you that approve of the above programme will vote the Black Republican ticket.

Frémont and his Negro Supporters.

Rev. Mr. Anderson, a negro of the darkest hue, is canvassing Indiana for Frémont. He made a speech at Rising Sun on Sunday of last week. He first sung a song, and then commenced as follows:

"I have been making Frémont speeches, and this is the fourth one I have made to-day. I am for Frémont, free speech, free soil, free negroes, and free white men when they behave themselves."

The Columbus (Ohio) Statesman says that two colored men, named Jenkins and Langston, are stumping the State for Frémont.

The Boston Bee, a Frémont paper, reports a meeting of the colored citizens of Boston, who passed the following:

"Resolved, That we, the colored citizens of Boston, will support, with our voices and votes, John C. Frémont, of California, as President of the United States, and William L. Dayton, of New Jersey, as Vice President."

A Frémont meeting held a few nights ago in Marlborough, Chester county, Pennsylvania, was addressed by a NEGRO!

At the last session of the Ohio Legislature, Mr. Cadwell, a member from Ashtabula, who is now one of Frémont's leading supporters in that section, spoke as follows:

"I thank God that the time has come in Ohio when it is no longer a disgrace to avow the sentiment that the negro

is the white man's equal and entitled to the same political and social privileges."

It will be seen by this that the Black Republicans advocate not only the political equality of the negro with the white man, but also the social equality!

The Question of Superiority Settled.

It would appear, by the following paragraph from the Martinsville Monitor, that the Black Republicans of Indiana have settled in their minds the question as to the relative superiority of the black and white races, which, after long study, Mr. Union-sliding Banks was unable to decide upon. The incident related occurred at a Frémont barbecue in Morgan county:

"The most characteristic part of the whole affair occurred at the table. A mechanic, who had hitherto been a strong Frémont man, was on the ground with his wife and child. At a given word, he attempted to cross the rope to the table, but was met by one of the marshals, and told to stand back and give room for the ladies. He stepped back, as he was told, when seven or eight women, 'AS BLACK AS THE ACE OF SPADES,' advanced before him to the table, and ate with the rest of the Frémont ladies and gentlemen. This was too much for him. He tore the Frémont badge from his breast, and swore that although he was a poor mechanic, he was yet a little better than a negro. He said that if he and his wife were to be thrust back from a Frémont barbecue, to give place to negroes, he no longer was a Frémont man, and immediately stamped the Frémont badge under his feet, and declared his intention to vote for Buchanan. We are informed that four or five others did likewise. It is said that not less than twenty negroes ate at the first table."

Coal-Black Republicans.

The "colored Republicans" held a mass meeting in Warren county, Ohio, on the 19th ultimo, and in the procession formed on the occasion there were three hundred negroes!

[From the Providence (Rhode Island) Post.]

The Political Priests!

Every city, and almost every large town, in New England, has its political priests. They are men who love distinction, and who cannot obtain it by preaching the Gospel. So they join hands with infidels and spiritualists, and feed their flocks with denunciations of Democracy, and abuse of the Government, to which they are indebted, more than to their own good behavior, for protection. With remarkable unanimity they are fighting men. They want to see civil war, and are therefore loud in their praises of Sharpe's rifles and bowie-knives. We will give specimens of the religion of this class of them.

In the Pittsburg convention, a few months ago, the Rev. Mr. Brewster said:

"He, for one, was in favor of using fire-arms, and fighting for freedom in Kansas."

The Rev. Mr. Chandler said:

"He believed that Sharpe's rifles were the best peace-makers; there was no danger too many of them would be introduced into Kansas."

The Rev. Mr. Lovejoy said:

"He was willing to go either as a captain or private. He would use Sharpe's rifles, and fire with good aim."

In the North Church, soon after, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher said:

"I hold it to be an everlasting disgrace to shoot at a man and not hit him!"

The Rev. Theodore Parker said lately, in his own church:

"He thought the people should rise at once in their might, and, by such a revolution as was never before heard of, sweep the myrmidons of a corrupt oligarchy from power by the strong arm of physical violence."

At a Kansas meeting, recently held in Boston, the Rev. H. James, of Worcester, said:

"There had been plenty of meetings and resolutions in favor of freedom. The best way would be to ram the resolution down with powder, and ball upon the top of it. For his part, he was ready to suffer, to go into the jaws of martyrdom, to save Kansas and his country. He knew not but that before this question was settled the country might roll in blood; but he was ready to enter the breach."

Elder Landon, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, said in Montrose, Susquehanna county, Pennsylvania, at a Frémont meeting, on the 20th ultimo: "Let the Constitution of the United States be torn into shreds, trampled under foot, and trust to God for a better one."

Rev. Mr. Tibbits, of Belfast, Maine, prays that "God will turn President Pierce from the error of his ways; but, if he cannot do that, that he will take him out of the world!"

Rev. A. T. Foss, of New Hampshire, who is now stumping in Ohio against Buchanan, says: "I have great hopes of the overthrow of the Union. Light is spreading fast, and the Union cannot bear the light."

Rev. Henry Ward Beecher says:

"The only hope of the slave is over the ruins of this Government and of the American Church. The dissolution of the Union is the abolition of slavery. The Constitution has been the fountain and father of our troubles." "Sharpe's rifles are better than Bibles."

Much more of the same treasonable sort we might quote, and perhaps may quote, as we find room for it hereafter. This, however, will show the religious mood of these political preachers.

But our readers should not get the impression that the priests are now dabbling in politics for the first time. In the time of Jefferson, the same class of hypocrites were quite as deep in the political mires as they now are; and during the war of 1812, they fairly foamed at the mouth with pious indignation. We will give a few sentences from some of the most patriotic of their sermons:

April 7, 1814, the Rev. Elijah Parish, D. D., of Byfield, said:

"How will the supporters of this anti-Christian warfare endure their sentence—endure their own reflections—endure the fire that forever burns—the worn that never dies—the hosannahs of Heaven—WHILE THE SMOKE OF THEIR TORMENTS ASCENDS FOREVER AND EVER."

The Rev. David Osgood, pastor of the church at Medford, in a discourse delivered June 27, 1812, said:

"If, at the command of weak or wicked rulers, they undertake an unjust war, each man who volunteers his services in such a cause, or loans his money for its support, or by his conversation, his writings, or any other mode of influence, encourages its prosecution, that man is an accomplice in the wickedness, loads his conscience with the blackest crimes, brings the guilt of blood upon his soul, and, IN THE SIGHT OF GOD AND HIS LAW, IS A MURDERER."

The Rev. I. S. J. Gardner, of Boston, in a discourse delivered July 23, 1812, said:

"It is a war unexampled in the history of the world; wantonly proclaimed on the most frivolous and groundless pretenses, against a nation from whose friendship we might derive the most signal advantages, and from whose hostility we have reason to dread the most tremendous losses."

And again, in the same sermon:

"THE UNION HAS BEEN LONG SINCE VIRTUALLY DISSOLVED; AND IT IS FULL TIME THAT THIS PART OF THE DISUNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE CARE OF ITSELF."

This will show that political preaching is nothing new. And we may add, that it is nothing to be frightened at. The American Union and the Democratic party have survived it, and will survive it, while there is a spark of patriotism in the breasts of the American people. But of political preaching and political preachers, how can we better speak than in the language of that greatest of English statesmen and modern philosophers, Edmund Burke? The following are his words:

"Politics and the pulpit are terms that have little agreement. No sound ought to be heard in the church but the voice of healing charity. The cause of civil liberty and civil government gains as little as that of religion by the confusion of duties. Those who quit their proper character to assume what does not belong to them, are, for the greater part, ignorant both of the character they leave and the character they assume. Wholly unacquainted with the world, in which they are so fond of meddling, and inexperienced in all its affairs, on which they pronounce with so much confidence, they know nothing of politics but the passion they excite. Surely the church is a place where one day's truce ought to be allowed to the dissensions and animosities of mankind."

[From the Union.]

A Perversion of Religious Associations.

In the extract which follows, from the Daily Jacksonian, our readers will see to what lengths the political enemies of our institutions are going in their blind fury for the conquest of the South, and the overthrow of the *equal rights of the States*. Is there a Christian in the land, free from religious fanaticism, who will approve the conversion of the American Missionary Association from religious to political purposes? Is there a patriot, North or South, who will not consider it as one of the most dangerous signs of the times? Ought it not to work a forfeiture of the public confidence in that association? Can an impartial and just man say no?

"CHURCH COLLECTIONS FOR FRÉMONT.—The following is the copy of a circular sent by the American Missionary Association to the churches throughout the country. The object is evidently to get up special collections for the purpose of prosecuting the sectional crusade now going on against our beleaguered Constitution. This is a pretty business, truly, for the "American Missionary Association" to be engaged in, and a pretty business for the churches of the land to be engaged in. How mournfully shameful, that everything hallowed, sacred, and of good report, in Church and State, should thus be prostituted and dragged through the dung-heap of sectional Abolitionism, and all to elevate a set of men, and inaugurate a set of principles that must end in the destruction of a righteous Church and a well-ordered and prosperous State!

"The Democracy and national patriots of all parties had best beware in time, and not wait supinely until they hear the cry, 'The Philistines be upon thee!' It will then be too late. They must be met before their plans are matured. It will readily occur to the mind of the reader, that a very large sum could be, and doubtless has been, raised to carry on this fearful crusade. Nothing can be more plain than the fact that this money is collected through the agency of the Missionary Society to swell the Frémont Republican electioneering fund. Is it not monstrous? Everything is to be turned into this filthy conduit, under the pretense of 'preparing the multitudes for the struggle for freedom to which the

nation is now called.'" Oh, horrid and wicked deception and delusion!

"The nation now enjoys the rich blessings of freedom. It is to plunge us into the horrors of civil commotion that can only end in despotism:

"ROOMS OF AMERICAN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION,
"48 Beckman street, N. Y., July 15, 1856.

"DEAR SIR: As an earnest friend of our cause, no argument with you is necessary to prove that the work of the American Missionary Association is indispensable. Its pure Christian and reformatory objects commend it; its *strong LIBERTY principles* and its *opposition to slavery* in the Church, in the State, and in connection with missionary and other operations, have made it peculiar, and have enlisted thousands in its support.

"It has been greatly owned and blessed of God in connection with the labors of its missionaries abroad and at home. In addition to what it has done for the evangelization of the heathen, it has done an important work in enlightening, correcting, and stimulating the public mind, in regard to the sin and multiplied evils of slavery, and in PREPARING MULTITUDES FOR THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM TO WHICH THE NATION IS NOW CALLED.

Its home missionaries, who are mostly in the northwestern States and Territories, have been instrumental for the conversion of very many souls to God, and are a most efficient moral force for freedom. Those who are in the slave States and in Kansas are struggling with slavery and preaching against it as a sin against God and destructive alike to the individual and the community. Not one of all the laborers now in the field can be dispensed with; but their number should be INCREASED.

"At this moment, when all true hearts are alive to the ENORMITIES of the SLAVERY POWER, and FOR THE DELIVERANCE OF KANSAS FROM ITS RULE OF FEROCITY—and when SPECIAL EFFORTS are necessarily made to meet the exigency—we are sorry to be compelled to ask a SPECIAL OFFERING to carry us through with the responsibilities of this fiscal year, (closing 31st August, proximo,) and without which the necessities of our missionaries cannot be supplied.

"We are constrained to ask the parties receiving this circular to aid us, so far as they can, by their donations, and by securing contributions from individuals, or by collections in congregations or Sabbath schools; and hope that even in churches and places of moderate means enough may be secured (\$30) to constitute some individual a life member of the association. The Lord loveth a cheerful giver, and blesseth all who are workers together with him to speed his glorious cause.

"May we not, dear sir, rely upon your hearty coöperation and efforts in this time of our GREAT NEED? Contributions should be forwarded to Lewis Tappan, in money, or in checks or drafts payable to his order as treasurer, as early as possible, and before the 1st of September next.

"Very respectfully, yours, &c.,

"GEO. WHIPPLE,

"S. S. JOCELYN,

"Corresponding Secretaries."

[From the Union.]

Mr. Fremont makes a Confession—He must secure the Votes of all.

With one single exception, and in that exception no expression of opinion was given, not the slightest allusion has ever been made in these

columns to the religious faith or sentiments of the Black Republican candidate for the Presidency. The only qualifications for the office of President called for by the Constitution are age and nativity; and the Democratic party have earnestly, steadfastly, and successfully opposed the efforts of bigots and proscriptionists to establish tests wholly foreign to the spirit of our people and their free institutions. It is not for us to question the right of Colonel Frémont to place himself in communion with either the Catholic or the Protestant Church; for we would be recreant to our duty, and false to the principles of our party, if our opposition to him was influenced in the most remote degree by a knowledge of his religious convictions.

We make these remarks in order that our position may not be mistaken, or our motives misconstrued, in giving place to the subjoined extraordinary statement, which we find in a late number of the New York Commercial Advertiser. The statement was made at a public meeting recently held at Staten Island, by Mr. B. F. Cook, and is in the following words, as reported in the Advertiser:

"Mr. B. F. Cook made some interesting and important statements respecting an interview he had with Colonel Frémont on the subject of his alleged Romanism. It was in substance this: Some friends having desired to enlist the speaker in the cause of so-called republicanism, he expressed a desire to have all doubts removed on this mooted question, but said that nothing short of an assurance from Colonel Frémont's own lips would satisfy him. An interview was arranged for. The object of the visit being understood by the Colonel, he avowed himself ready to answer any question proposed. Mr. Cook proposed the following, and received to each the answer annexed: 'Were you married by a Roman Catholic priest?' 'I was'—the Colonel's lip quivering as he spoke. Did you at the time believe in, or profess to believe in, the Roman Catholic religion?' 'I did not.' 'Have you before or since, or at any time, professed the Catholic religion?' 'I have not.' Here Mr. Cook bowed to signify that he had no more questions to ask. Colonel Frémont then volunteered some remarks to the following effect: That while in California he attended no church; and that he occupied his Sundays in reading and writing, and in attending to such matters of business as he thought of importance. Mr. Frémont further said: 'I am frequently interrogated by all parties on this subject. I presume the delegation now waiting for me up stairs wish to interrogate me on this point. When they do, I shall put the most favorable construction on the matter that I can. I wish to offend none, but to secure the votes of all. Only this very morning, I have a letter from Maine, saying that unless I make a personal denial of Romanism, and that if I am or have been a Roman Catholic, that State will be lost to the Republicans; and another letter from Indiana, telling me that if I will authorize my friends there to say I am a Roman Catholic, they can secure me a large German and Irish vote. I have to frame my replies so as to secure the votes of all. There is now a deputation waiting for me, whose errand I doubt not is the same. It is best to say as little about this matter as possible, and we must manage the thing as well as we can, so as to get the votes of both sides.' Here the interview termin-

ated. Mr. Cook's statement was listened to with profound interest."

The character and standing of Mr. Cook are thus spoken of by the Advertiser:

"We give elsewhere in to-day's Commercial, an interesting account of an interview with Colonel Frémont, on the subject of his alleged Papal tendencies, by a gentleman well known as a wholesale stationer in this city, and a resident at Factoryville, Staten Island. No one who knows the narrator will question the entire veracity and moderation of his statement. We have been for some time cognizant of all the circumstances of the interview, and of the causes also that led to it."

After reading the above statement of Mr. Cook, the conclusion is irresistible that Mr. Frémont's religion, if he has any, sits as lightly upon him as his political principles. To the Protestants of Maine he says: "Place no credit in the stories that are circulated in regard to my religious faith. I am no Catholic, never have been and never will be." To the Catholics of Indiana he says: "How can you refuse to vote for me? Am I not of your religious faith?" To the indifferent in religious matters he says: "Keep quiet; say nothing. I am a Protestant with the Protestants, and a Catholic with the Catholics—all things unto all men. I must so shape my conduct and answers as to secure the votes of all!"

The school of ethics in which Mr. Frémont has been taught, is not the school which has sent forth pure patriots and genuine Christians; and although he is now able to turn his double face with remarkable dexterity—first to one religious locality and then to another—he must, in the end, awaken a feeling of honest indignation in the breast of every sincere Christian, whether of the Catholic or Protestant faith.

[From the Union.]

How Fremont Proposes to get the Votes of Both Sides.

A few days ago we transferred to our columns, from the New York Commercial Advertiser, Mr. B. F. Cook's account of an interview between himself and Mr. Frémont in relation to the religious views entertained by the latter. It will be recollected that in the course of the interview, Mr. F. said—we quote from Mr. Cook's statement:

"I have to frame my replies so as to secure the votes of all. It is best to say as little about this matter as possible; and we must manage the thing as well as we can, so as to get the votes of both sides."

The disclosures of Mr. Cook have so shocked the moral and religious sense of the community in which they were made public, that the Black Republican organs have been compelled to notice them, not as the mean and shabby fabrications of a corrupt and excited politician anxious to make capital for his party at all hazards, but as the statement of a gentleman of unblemished private character—a bigot in religion, it is true, but whose bigotry does not render him insensible to the obligations of truth and honor. Most of these organs attempt to extricate their presidential candidate from the disgraceful predicament in which he is placed by indirectly asserting that Mr. Cook has betrayed confidence, and that he can be viewed by the public in no other light than that of a spy. The New York Courier and Enquirer, however, with its accustomed swagger and bravado, adopts

another line of defense. It attempts to discredit Mr. Cook's statement by the unsupported contradiction of unnamed witnesses, and boldly declares that, unless the statement takes the form of an affidavit, it will excite no other feeling in the public mind than that of contempt and disbelief.

Contrary to the expectations, and certainly contrary to the wishes of the *Courier*, Mr. Cook has made the called-for affidavit. It is plain, explicit, and is apparently free from that spirit of exaggeration which is apt to influence too many who assume the office and responsibilities of a narrator."

The affidavit starts out with the substance of a conversation which took place between Mr. Cook and a Mr. Potter a few weeks ago. Mr. Cook likes Mr. Frémont very well in the main, and would vote for him if he was satisfied that he was not a Catholic. His friend Potter assures him that Frémont is not a Catholic, and to convince him of the correctness of his assurance, agrees to take him (Cook) to Frémont's house, where he can be satisfied by word of mouth, and without the intervention of a second party. The two start for the residence of Mr. Frémont, and not the least interesting part of the affidavit is the detailed account of the trials and disappointments to which both were subjected before they were finally admitted to an audience with the Black Republican candidate for the Presidency. For the benefit of those who contemplate a pilgrimage to "No. 56 Ninth street, New York," it may not be out of place here to state—we quote from the affidavit—that the "second Washington" has given orders to his servants to assure all common visitors that "he is out of town, and will not return for three weeks," although he has been for some time, and is now, in the comfortable occupancy of his elegantly-furnished mansion in the street and city already designated.

We pass over Mr. Cook's amusing adventures in search of Frémont and the truth, and come to the pith of the affidavit. Mr. Cook puts the question plainly and directly to Mr. Frémont in regard to his religious belief. Mr. Frémont's reply, as sworn to by Mr. Cook, was as follows:

"In reference to my marriage, all that I can say is, that I have taken little interest in the tenets of that Church, and know but little about them. But myself and wife were married by a Catholic; and I believe that there are many instances where Protestants have been married by Catholic clergymen."

"[He here mentioned a case, but I do not remember the names.]

"In regard to my being a Catholic while in California, I can say that, while there, I labored excessively hard, and when Sunday came I was very much fatigued, and did not feel like going to church, although my wife did, when it was convenient. But I generally stayed at home, and spent my time in reading, writing, and attending to such matters of business as I considered of importance; and to my knowledge I was never inside of any church while in California.

"He then said: 'I am often asked about my being a Catholic by all parties, and even by Catholic delegations; and I presume the one up stairs now waiting for an interview with me wishes to interrogate me on this same question. When they do, I shall put the most favorable construction upon

the matter that I can, wishing to offend no one, but secure the votes of all. It will not do to deny these things too stoutly, for it is securing me very many votes.'"

As we stated on a former occasion, we have no desire to disturb Mr. Frémont in the enjoyment of his religious opinions, whatever they may be; but he and his supporters will yet find, to their cost, that no public man ever yet pandered with impunity to opposing religious prejudices. In hypocritically attempting "to secure the votes of all," he may lose the votes of both sides.

A New Move.

It will be seen by the letter below, which we clip from the *Pennsylvanian*, that, after all that has been said and done, Frémont is a Catholic. We are not surprised at any folly or deception which may be adopted by the Frémont managers. A set of men who could deliberately set to work to usurp all the functions of the American Government, are neither too wise nor too conscientious for any other scheme, however stupid or corrupt. But here is the letter:

ABBOTTSTOWN, ADAMS COUNTY, PA.,
August 28, 1856.

MR. EDITOR: There is a damnable secret crusade going on against us here. Hired emissaries are traveling throughout the country for the purpose of converting the Catholic vote for Frémont. These consummate hypocrites are representing themselves as Catholics, and *Frémont as a Catholic*. No doubt they are paid for it. Watch them, and take some course to baffle them.

I will write again, as the mail is about leaving and I must conclude.

Yours,

D. S. P.

The direct evidence which satisfies many that Mr. Frémont is now, or has been recently, a Papist by denomination, is contained in the following letter of Mr. Sargent, well known as Register of the Treasury, under Mr. Fillmore, and in other public positions:

Letter from Hon. Nathan Sargent.

WASHINGTON, August 2, 1856.

DEAR SIR: I have your note of the 28th July, inquiring where Colonel William Russell, of Missouri, resides or may be addressed, and asking me what he has said, or will say, in reference to Colonel Frémont's religious opinions?

Colonel Russell's residence is at Harrisonville, Cass county, Missouri; but I am informed he is at present in Baltimore on a visit.

Colonel Russell is a man who will say what he has said; and he has said to me that Colonel Frémont was a Catholic when he was in California. I spent an evening with Colonel Russell at Browns' Hotel two or three weeks ago, and knowing that he had been much with Colonel Frémont in California, and on very intimate terms with him, I asked him if he knew anything of Colonel Frémont's religious views at that time. He replied that he did; that he was with him a great deal, and, in fact, might say that he had slept under the same blanket with him for eight months. I then asked him what Colonel Frémont was. He replied, "a Catholic." I asked him if he was sure of this. "Perfectly," he said, and then

added: "Colonel Frémont won't deny that he was a Catholic; everybody there so understood it, and he made no secret of it."

Further conversation occurred between us on the subject, but this is the sum and substance of it. I asked him if I might refer to this conversation, and use his name. He replied "certainly; you are at liberty to do so." But he again said, "Colonel Frémont will not deny that he was a Catholic."

Colonel Russell, you may not be aware, was Colonel Frémont's principal witness on his trial before the court-martial.² Should Colonel Frémont deny, over his own signature, that he was a Catholic when in California, I presume Colonel Russell will then speak for himself.

Colonel Russell is an old, ardent, personal, friend of Henry Clay, with whose family his own is connected, his daughter having married Mr. Clay's grandson.

I am, very truly, your obedient servant,

N. SARGENT.

A. B. ELY, Esq.

[From the Union.]

The Freedom of Speech and Debate, as Illustrated by Colonel Frémont.

Political partisans occasionally prefer charges against their adversaries to divert scrutiny from their own assailable points. Such strategy sometimes results in success, but often in defeat. The partisans of the Frémont ticket have resorted to charges and harsh epithets against their adversaries upon a subject where their candidate is very vulnerable. They have sought to turn the occurrence between Messrs Brooks and Sumner to political account, on the untenable ground that the Democratic party is responsible for the acts of one who goes with them politically. If such a position were maintainable, all political parties might be crushed on account of the unjustifiable acts of individuals in their respective ranks. On the other hand, parties are justly and properly held responsible for their selection of candidates for high political positions for whom they solicit votes. Let us apply these principles: Mr. Sumner, in a speech delivered in the Senate, applied epithets of disparagement and severity to the State of South Carolina and Senator Butler, when he was absent. Mr. Brooks, of the House, a relative of the absent Senator, took offense at these remarks concerning his State and relative, sought out Mr. Sumner, and inflicted severe blows upon him. In a court of justice, Mr. Brooks admitted the illegality of his act, and made the reparation required by the minister of justice, as an atonement for the offense. All this was purely a personal matter between the parties. Mr. Sumner spoke upon his personal responsibility, and Mr. Brooks resented it in his individual capacity. Neither acted for, or represented, a political party. If Mr. Sumner untruly described South Carolina, her motives and acts, or the character, qualifications, and intentions of her Senator, it would be unjust to hold Colonel Frémont responsible. If Mr. Brooks acted illegally, violated the sanctity of the Senate Chamber, or sought wrongfully to control the freedom of debate, it is equally unjust to hold Mr. Buchanan, or the Democratic party, accountable. On both sides they are personal acts, for which the parties themselves are solely responsible. Mr. Sumner has never pretended that his strictures on Senator Butler and South

Carolina were occasioned by the fact that he supported Colonel Frémont, or that Mr. Butler favored Mr. Buchanan, for the Presidency.

Mr. Brooks has never placed his vindication upon the ground that he and Mr. Sumner differed upon political subjects, but upon the alleged insult to his State and relative. We appeal to the principles of justice, which are implanted in the hearts of all candid men, to say whether Frémont or his party are responsible for the speech of Mr. Sumner, or Mr. Buchanan or his party for the acts of Mr. Brooks. We are confident that the response will be, that, whether their acts are justified or condemned, and whether they have acquired or lost reputation by what they respectively did, the whole is personal, and that the political parties to which they belong should in no way be prejudiced or benefited by the acts referred to.

It cannot have been forgotten that on former occasions caustic and severe remarks uttered in debate have led to acts of violence, and sometimes eventuating in death. The vituperation of John Randolph induced Henry Clay to call him to the field, where shots designed to take life were exchanged. Cilley's denunciation of the venality of the New York Courier induced Webb to challenge him for words spoken in debate, and his refusal to admit that he was responsible to him on that account led Graves, Webb's second, to seek and take his life in a duel. Numerous other duels and personal encounters have occurred, but no one has heretofore attempted to hold presidential candidates responsible for such acts of third persons, where they have not actually approved of them or the principles which occasioned them.

It will be conceded that Mr. Buchanan is entirely guiltless of all attempts at personal aggressions, or disposition to participate in personal strife, or engage in political abuse. A long life of personal and professional kindness, and devotion to those duties which attach man to his brother man, are guarantees that he is no advocate or supporter of personal violence as a remedy for political error. He is known to be the personification of liberality of opinions, and distinguished for gentleness and courtesy—qualities which appropriately accord with the genius and policy of our institutions. He would sooner suffer personal wrong than seek justice through the agency of personal violence and wrong, or by means prohibited by law.

The "Republican" party having sought to prejudice Mr. Buchanan on account of the acts of Mr. Brooks, we desire to call the attention of law-abiding men to acts of their candidate himself, showing his belligerent propensities and his willingness to take human life for words which he deemed offensive. Indisputable facts place Colonel Frémont in a position which no friend of peace and order can possibly justify. They show that he demanded this privilege of shooting at two men for words spoken, not intended to be personally offensive.

On his trial before the court-martial who adjudged his dismissal from the service, he attempted to prove that Colonel Mason said to him, "None of your insolence, or I will put you in irons." From this it is clearly inferable that Frémont had used disrespectful language to a superior. Nevertheless, for these words he challenged Colonel Mason to mortal combat, first requiring from

his superior officer an apology by the following note:

"CIUDAD DE LOS ANGELES,
"April 14, 1847.

"SIR: I have the honor to request, through my friend, Major P. B. Reading, who will hand you this note, that you apologize for the injurious language applied to me this day.

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
JOHN C. FRÉMONT,
"Lieutenant Colonel Mounted Riflemen.

"Colonel R. B. MASON, Colonel Dragoons, Ciudad de los Angeles."

Colonel Mason replied as follows:

"ANGELES, April 14, 1847.

"SIR: I have just received your note of this evening, and can only repeat in writing what I stated to you verbally when we parted, viz: 'I thought you intended to be so. You best know whether you did or not.' Your not disavowing it left me to infer that I was not mistaken; with that impression upon my mind, I can say nothing until it be removed.

"I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,
"R. B. MASON.

"Lieutenant Colonel J. C. FRÉMONT, Mounted Riflemen."

"CIUDAD DE LOS ANGELES,
"April 14, 1847.

"SIR: An apology having been declined, Major Reading will arrange the necessary preliminaries for a meeting requiring personal satisfaction.

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
"JOHN C. FRÉMONT,
"Lieutenant Colonel Mounted Riflemen.

"Colonel R. B. MASON."

It will be observed that Colonel Mason thought Frémont intended to be insolent to him, and that he, neither orally or otherwise, denied that he so intended. It is clear that if he had disavowed the intention to be insolent and insult Colonel Mason, the latter would have withdrawn his remarks. Colonel Mason then wrote him as follows:

"ANGELES, April 15, 1847.

"SIR: With a view to the adjustment of my private affairs, it is necessary that I return to Monterey before I afford you the meeting you desire. We shall probably meet there within a few days of each other. I will then, as soon as circumstances will permit, arrange the necessary preliminaries for a meeting.

"I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,
"R. B. MASON.

"Lieutenant Colonel FRÉMONT, Mounted Riflemen."

"CIUDAD DE LOS ANGELES,
"April 15, 1847.

"SIR: I am in the receipt of your letter of this date, and, in reply, have the honor to state that I will hold myself in readiness for a meeting at Monterey, at such time as you may designate.

"I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"JOHN C. FRÉMONT,
"Lieutenant Colonel Mounted Riflemen.

"Colonel R. B. MASON, First Dragoons."

"A day or two after these notes Colonel Mason went to Monterey; after Mason arrived there,

General Kearny came down to Los Angeles, and had a conversation with Lieutenant Colonel Frémont on the subject of the duel, saying he forbade it, and had left an order in Monterey to that effect. Frémont soon followed to Monterey. On arriving there, Captain Tyler, an intimate of Mason's, called on Lieutenant Colonel Frémont; said he did not come by direction of Mason—that he had talked with him about it—that Mason did not intend to insult him, &c. Lieutenant Colonel Frémont paid no attention to this—went to Mason's quarters—was invited to sit down—did not—said he came to let Mason see he was there—and walked out."

Colonel Frémont soon after, on the 4th of May, 1847, received orders from General Kearny, directing him "to proceed no further in this matter."

Commodore Biddle, of the Navy, remonstrated in writing with Colonel Mason on the impropriety, considering the state of public affairs in California, of officers engaging in duels; whereupon the latter inclosed a copy of his letter, and proposed to postpone the meeting to a more suitable occasion. Colonel Frémont replied:

"MONTEREY, May 22, 1847.

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, on yesterday, of your note of the 19th instant, accompanied by a copy of a letter from Commodore Biddle to yourself. The object of your note appears to be to induce me to consent to a further and indefinite postponement of a meeting. If such be your desire, I am willing to comply with it, trusting that you will apprise me of the earliest moment at which the meeting can take place consistently with your convenience and sense of propriety.

"I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,
"J. C. FRÉMONT.

"Colonel R. B. MASON, Monterey."

This correspondence and the above-quoted statements are found in a speech of Colonel Benton, delivered in a secret session of the Senate, and reported by him in the Appendix of the Congressional Globe, in 1848, at pages 1001 and 1002.

The assumed cause of offense clearly implies that Frémont insulted Mason, and it was so understood by the latter, while the former did not disclaim the intention. The letters of Frémont exhibit a disposition to take human life, not only without any reasonable cause, but they display a persistency of motive and purpose which indicate characteristics of temper and disposition which no law-loving and peaceable citizen can approve. This is not the case of a single individual of a party attempting to violate the law, but that of the chosen leader and candidate of a party for the highest office to which man can be elevated.

In selecting him for the Presidency, the "Republican party impliedly approve of his seeking the life of a fellow-man for words spoken under the irritation of supposed personal and undisclaimed insult. Should this precedent be followed, duels and murders would fill the country with mourning and sorrow. Can those who support a candidate whose impulses lead him to taking life for words spoken by one who had the right to repel insolence and insult, consistently reproach and denounce a whole party for the acts of an individual? Is the desire to take human life less abhorrent than unauthorized blows?

"But this instance of Frémont's imperious, exacting, and unrestrained passions is not a solitary one. In 1850 his views of the freedom of senatorial debate were conspicuously and strikingly exemplified. When the California land bill was before the Senate, Mr. Foote, a Senator from Mississippi, made remarks which Frémont deemed derogatory to him, and he pronounced them false. The following account of the transaction was given in a prominent newspaper at the time:

"Afterwards they met in the ante-chamber, when Frémont struck Foote and brought blood. They were immediately separated by Senator Clarke. Subsequently Frémont addressed a note to Foote, demanding a retraction of the language used by him in debate, to be signed in the presence of witnesses, and a challenge note was left if he refused. Mr. Foote declined to sign the paper, but addressed a note in reply to Frémont, disclaiming any intention of giving any personal offense in the language used by him in debate."

The friends of the parties deemed Mr. Foote's note satisfactory, and a card was published declaring the matter adjusted. It will be seen that Frémont required an apology in writing, which, if not given, a challenge, which was left, was to become effective. It thus appears that Frémont proposed, if the words used were not retracted, to call a Senator to the field, with the view of taking his life, or losing his own. Let this be contrasted with the case of blows given for a like cause. If obedience to his demands was not yielded, his intention was to sacrifice human life, under circumstances which would render it murder—and that, too, for words spoken in debate, and not intended to be personal. Ought not this act of Frémont to close the mouths of his supporters in relation to the Brooks and Sumner affair? If they denounce the former, must they not also denounce and condemn Frémont? Did not Frémont, in the cases of Mason and Foote, seek to commit the far greater crime, and in the restraint of the liberty of speech and the freedom of debate?

But if the cases were parallel, it should be remembered that the one is merely a supporter of the Democratic party, while the other has been chosen by the "Republicans" as the representative of their principles, with the hope of making him the Chief Magistrate of the Confederacy. Do his supporters approve his practice in these cases, and do they expect to follow his precedents? Do they wish them to prevail in our community? If elected, would Frémont carry out his own precedents in relation to the freedom of speech and debate? Do he and his supporters approve the pistol or rifle remedy for whatever gives them offense? Are not our laws ample for the protection of character as well as property? Do they desire men whose passions are aroused to take the law into their own hands, and control their fellow-men with deadly weapons? Do they wish to commit the destinies of our country to one whose instincts or passions impel him to seek the lives of those who speak otherwise than respectfully of him?

[From the Union.]

Why Colonel Fremont disobeyed General Kearny's orders, which occasioned his Trial and Dismission from the Military Service.

When Commodore Stockton arrived in California, in July, 1846, and took command of the

land and naval forces of the United States there, Brevet Captain Frémont placed himself under the Commodore's command, and accepted from him the office of major in the volunteer corps of dragoons, and continued subject to his orders. Before the completion of the conquest, General Kearny arrived, and aided in that work. Commodore Stockton's orders emanated from the naval, and General Kearny's from the military, branch of the Government. In view of the extent of powers confided to each, and the difference in their dates, a question of the right to the exclusive command arose between the Commodore and the General, and each insisted upon obedience of those in subordinate positions, including Major Frémont. Instead of resorting to the usual means of ascertaining which he ought to obey, Colonel Frémont resorted to a new mode of determination, that speaks volumes concerning his ruling passion. General Kearny, on the 16th of January, 1847, served a notice in writing, requiring him to obey his orders. He replied in writing, on the 17th, refusing so to do. On Colonel Frémont's trial, General Kearny, in narrating this matter, testified as follows:

"On the day subsequent—namely, the 17th day of January—Lieutenant Colonel Frémont came to my quarters, and, in conversation, I asked him if he had received the communication from me of the previous day. He acknowledged the receipt of it; stated that he had written a reply, and had left it with his clerk to copy. About this time a person entered the room with a paper in his hand, which Lieutenant Colonel Frémont took, overlooked, and then used a pen on my table to sign it—his clerk having told him his signature was wanting. Having signed the paper, Colonel Frémont then handed it to me. It was his letter to me of January 17. At my request he took a seat at my table while I read it. Having finished the reading of it, I told Colonel Frémont that I was a much older man than himself, and that I was a much older soldier than himself; that I had great regard for his wife, and great friendship for his father-in-law, Colonel Benton, from whom I had received many acts of kindness; that these considerations induced me to volunteer advice to him, and the advice was that he should take that letter back and destroy it; that I was willing to forget it. Colonel Frémont declined to take it back, and told me that Commodore Stockton would support him in the position taken in that letter. I told him that Commodore Stockton could not support him in disobeying the orders of his superior officer, and that, if he persisted in it, he would unquestionably ruin himself.

"He told me that Commodore Stockton was about to organize a civil government, and intended to appoint him as Governor of the Territory. I told him that Commodore Stockton had no such authority—that authority having been conferred on me by the President of the United States. He asked me if I would appoint him Governor. I told him I expected shortly to leave California for Missouri; that I had, previous to leaving Santa Fe, asked for permission to do so, and was in hopes of receiving it; and that as soon as the country was quieted I should most probably organize a civil government in California, and that I, at that time, knew no objections to my appointing him as the Governor. He then stated to me that he would see Commodore Stockton, and THAT, UNLESS HE APPOINTED HIM GOVERNOR AT ONCE,

HE WOULD NOT OBEY HIS ORDERS, AND LEFT ME." (General S. W. Kearny's evidence on Colonel Frémont's trial, Senate Documents 1847-'8, vol. 5, pp. 38, 39.)

Commodore Stockton did, by a commission dated the day previous, (January 16, 1847,) appoint him Governor and commander-in-chief of the conquered Territory, and he obeyed his orders, and continued to refuse obedience to those of General Kearny. He was charged before the court-martial with "mutiny," "disobedience of the lawful command of his superior officer," and "conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline," and convicted upon each charge, and sentenced to be "dismissed from the service." President Polk disapproved the finding on the first charge, but approved of the last two.

The evidence of General Kearny, which is wholly uncontradicted, clearly shows that the sole question with Colonel Frémont was his appointment to the office of Governor, which, after having his eye upon his Mariposa purchase, and other transactions in California, became an important matter to him personally. He expressly declared that he would not obey Commodore Stockton, "unless he would appoint him Governor or at once." The inference is indisputable, that if the Commodore did not do so, then he would obey General Kearny, who had expressed a willingness to appoint him at a future day, and as soon as things became quiet, and before his departure for home. Had Commodore Stockton been apprised of what passed between General Kearny and Colonel Frémont, and the motives which impelled the latter, he doubtless would have refused him both the appointment and his confidence. No one doubts that the Commodore thought himself right in what he insisted on, and his high-toned and gallant spirit would have shrunk from according anything to such selfish, personal motives. The records of the military and naval service do not show another instance of an officer's obedience being made dependent upon his appointment to a high office. Is there a high-minded, honest man who can approve the motive of Colonel Frémont in this instance? Will one officer in the Army or Navy declare it to be honorable and proper? Can his politician partisans do so without blushing?

[From the Newark Eagle.]

astounding Developments!—Colonel Frémont's Financial Operations.

We find in the Washington Union the first installment of the report on Frémont's financial operations in California, which was called for by the Senate. The Republican press might well wince in advance at these astounding developments. We have not space to-day for any comment, and we give a general outline of the facts stated, so far as we have received them. We premise by saying, that the documents show that the board of claims only allowed \$140,000 of the claims set up by Frémont, or *one seventh* of the whole amount, leaving some EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS STILL UNPAID, and which will never be paid until Frémont is elected President.

Look at some of the items: The first item is a claim for \$24,750 for cattle said to have been taken from one Vallejo, for the use of the United States. Frémont certifies, on honor, that the claim is correct. It appears, from the items of the bill,

that Government was asked to pay for cattle to an extent which would furnish each man in Frémont's detachment with *an ox each day!* and Frémont certifies, "on his honor," that the bill was a correct one, and the supplies were used by his men! The board of claims showed what they thought of it by striking off \$10,000 from the bill, by a unanimous vote.

Next we have a bill for \$82,625 for this same Vallejo—horses at \$100, saddles at \$50, spurs at \$5, and so on. To this Frémont also certifies "upon honor." By a unanimous vote the board struck off *fifty thousand dollars* from this bill.

Next we have a bill from Vallejo for \$53,160 for horses, at \$130 each, saddles at \$100 each, one rifle at *two hundred dollars*, pistols at *one hundred dollars* each, and other charges in the same proportion. All these bills are formally made out as supplies furnished to Frémont, and Frémont certifies on his honor that the bills are correct, and the goods charged at fair prices. The board again, by a unanimous vote, struck off *forty-one thousand dollars* from this bill.

We have then another bill from Vallejo for \$14,010, for mules, cows, &c. The board struck off \$9,975 from this.

This Vallejo seems to have been a pretty big operator in Government supplies, and *somebody* must have expected to have made a large haul out of Uncle Sam. As Frémont did everything in his power to push the bills through, going to the length of certifying them "*upon his honor*," some pretty ugly inferences are irresistible.

But perhaps the most extraordinary of all is the next claim. William D. Phelps brings in a bill for *ten thousand dollars* for ferrying Frémont and a detachment of men across the bay! Frémont certifies that the bill is correct. Major Gillespie, of the marine corps, testifies that the ferryage was only seven miles; that no risk was run; that the only object in crossing was to spike some guns in a dismantled fort, which was entirely unoccupied at the time. By a unanimous vote, the board declared that *fifty dollars* was an ample remuneration! and so allowed. And yet there is added to the claim a deliberate certificate of Colonel Frémont that the bill for ten thousand dollars was right and just.

The documents following these are substantially the same we have before given as to money borrowed by Frémont, the claim for which was allowed to the parties, as the money was undoubtedly had of them, but the board recommended that the same be charged to Frémont himself!

The documents from which we obtain these facts are official transcripts from the records of the Department, and are furnished by the Auditor of the Treasury. It is impossible to *lie* them down. With a man at the head of the Government who feeds his men at the rate of an ox per day, pays one hundred dollars apiece for saddles, two hundred dollars for rifles, and ten thousand dollars for seven miles ferryage, Uncle Sam would not be long bothered with a surplus in his Treasury. No wonder Webb and Bennett "shriek for freedom," with such fat pickings in prospect.

The Second Washington.

Some of the Black Republicans out West are illustrating their banners with portraits of Frémont, labeled "The Second Washington." The

points of resemblance between the first Washington and the "second," are thus set forth by the Rochester Union:

"Washington never dogged a man from place to place and endeavored to badger him into a duel.

"Washington never challenged a man to mortal combat.

"Washington never speculated in beef, to the prejudice of his country.

"Washington never certified 'on honor' to the correctness of a charge, and then had it cut down by the auditing officer from ten thousand to fifty dollars.

"Washington never accepted a nomination from a party which proscribed foreigners and Catholics as unworthy the name of American.

"Washington never encouraged the formation of sectional parties."

Daniel Webster

Said, in a speech delivered in 1850, in alluding to the alienation of the North from the South:

"This prejudice has been produced by the incessant attrition of abolition doctrines, by abolition presses, and by abolition lectures upon the common mind. No drum-head, in the longest day's march, was ever more incessantly beaten than the feelings in certain parts of the North. They have been beaten incessantly, every month, and every day, and every hour, by the din and roll and rub-a-dub of the abolition presses and the abolition lectures, and that it is which has created these prejudices."

[From the Union.]

A Word to the People.

In view of the angry and dangerous controversy that is now agitating the country, we would ask a thoughtful attention to the most remarkable contrast between the character of the men who framed our Government, and brought it into successful operation, and those who are now prosecuting every means of desperation to sectionalize or subvert the Government. For wisdom, virtue, and patriotism—for all the great and glorious elements of character that dignify and adorn human nature in its highest and purest range—Washington and his compatriots hold unequalled eminence. Through every trial of long-suffering, danger, and discouragement, they went through a war of more than seven years, and sealed with their blood the mighty triumph of our independence.

This was the first step; the next was to form a Government to carry out the great principles for which they fought.

The same men sheathed the sword and took up the pen in peaceful, solemn council, to frame a Government for the people by the people. It was a great task imposed upon wisdom and virtue to conquer the conflicting interests and opinions that were inseparable from the work. These were to be reconciled and harmonized as neces-

sary to the consummation of the great end and object.

They accomplished it, to their everlasting honor, by cherishing a holy brotherhood, by subordinating everything to the one great purpose, and by laying covenant, concessions, and compromises on the altar of their infant country.

The work was not yet fully accomplished. The next and last step in this labor of love was to bring this delicate and complex conception into practical operation.

The same pure master mind that led their armies to victory, and counseled them in their polity, was called to the civil administration of the Government. History tells us how wisely he directed all things, and how well the vast machinery fulfilled every hope and every expectation. From his retirement at Mount Vernon he watched and prayed for his beloved country until he resigned his eventful life.

His co-laborers, though less renowned, shared his virtues and his immortality. Their great example is before us, and, lamentable to say, it is treated almost as a fable in this degenerate age. The proof is broadcast throughout the land. We have it in the guilty, criminal *sectionalism* that is dividing our brotherhood and tearing our Union asunder with unholy hands and for unrighteous purposes. Patriotism is banished in the reign of licentiousness; treason is stalking abroad unmasked; fratricidal blood is staining the land; fanaticism is strewing its baleful influence; the pulpit is desecrating its divine office by embracing the worst elements of political heresy; and these combined powers are pulling down the pillars of our great national temple, erected by Washington and his associates. This is the sad spectacle of the day!

If it should fall from its tottering base, who will survive the ruin? Some historian will look over the vast desolation, and will record the names of the traitors who conceived the fatal conspiracy, and the party that ruined the last home of civil and religious liberty.

We have but a short time left us to cure this impending calamity. We must not shut our eyes to our true condition, but realize it by looking at it, and tracing its consequences.

If we are capable of being true to ourselves, and rightly comprehending our all-important interests; if we have enough of virtue to choose discreetly between the principles of the great and good men that toiled for our rich inheritance, and the base heresies that are supplanting them; if we would have our Union permanent and our Government prosperous, we must come promptly to the conclusion that we have departed widely from our duty, and that our only safety is in a speedy return to the paths and example of those who had virtue and patriotism beyond the reach of faction and the temptations of unholy ambition.

We are aware that the agitations that surround us make this not an auspicious moment to proclaim danger. But duty constrains us to repeat the warning that we have often given.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 136 030 9

